

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20592 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2025 Thana- Pothia District- Katihar

=====

Raj Kumar Pandit @ Raj Kumar S/o- Late Bindeshwari Pandit Resident of
Village- Chandpur, PS- Pothiya, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pankaj Pandit S/o- Prasadi Pandit Resident of Village- Chandpur, W.No-2,
PS- Pothiya, District- Katihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate Mr. Vivekanand Jha, Advocate Ms. Isha Mishra, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rananjay Kumar, Advocate Mr. Md. Noumaan Ahmad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 13-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Pothiya P.S. Case No. 25 of 2025 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 137(2), 96, 64(1) and 3(5) of the
B.N.S., 2023 and Sections 4/6 of the POCSO Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the
petitioner has kidnapped the minor daughter of the informant
and thereafter committed rape with her.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has



committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that during the course of the investigation, the victim has given her statement recorded under sections 180 and 183 of the B.N.S.S., wherein she has stated that as she was seen by her family members talking to the petitioner, she was beaten by her parents. She went to the house of the petitioner and forced him to flee away whereupon the petitioner and the informant fled to Delhi. He also submits that from perusal of the medical examination report, it will transpire that the victim has denied with the medical examination. Moreover, a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 12.04.2025.

5. The application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned APP for the State. Learned counsel for the informant submits that in this case, save and except the Investigating Officer (I.O.), all witnesses have been examined.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case that as the trial as its **fag end**, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however, the petitioner will be at



liberty to renew his prayer for bail after two months if the trial is not concluded.

7. Learned trial court is directed to conclude the same within two months.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

