

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17750 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-339 Year-2024 Thana- JANDAHA District- Vaishali

=====

Veer Bahadur Singh S/o Late Mukundchand Singh (wrongly nameed as FIR
as Late Baidya Nath Singh), R/o Vill- Singeyahi, P.S.- Jandaha, Distt- Vaishali
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Purushottam Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 18-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Jandaha P.S. Case No. 339 of 2024, instituted for the offences
under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118, 109, 326(f), 326(g), 324(4),
324(5), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for bail.
The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of regular bail
which was earlier rejected by this Court vide order dated
09.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 28179 of 2025 taking into
consideration the nature and gravity of the offence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 27.09.2024
without any rhymes or reason and has got two criminal



antecedents in which he is on bail. It is also submitted that earlier, the petitioner was granted liberty to renew his prayer for bail before the learned Court below if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months, but the trial has not been completed and out of six charge-sheeted witnesses, only one witness has been examined in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that the continued incarceration of the petitioner without conclusion of trial amounts to a gross violation of the fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which reiterated by Hon'ble Apex Court in plethora of Judgments.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and taking into account the fact that continued detention of the petitioner would serve no purpose other than punitive pretrial incarceration, which is antithetical to the spirit of Article 21 of the Constitution of India, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) with two



sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Jandaha P.S. Case No. 339 of 2024, subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be own/close member of the family of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial. In case of default in such appearance on two consecutive dates, the Trial Court will have liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

