

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22699 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-192 Year-2024 Thana- KHIRI MORE District- Patna

Shiv Kant Sharma @ Shivakant Sharma @ Shivkant Sharma Son of Late
Laldeo Sharma @ Lal Deo Sharma R/o Village - Mungila, P.S. - Khirimore,
District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rinku Devi W/o Ram Raj Singh R/o Village - Mungila, Imamganj, P.S. -
Khirimore, Dist. - Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhukar Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 01-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sessions Trial No. 1537 of 2024, arising out of Khirimore P.S.
Case No. 192 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Section
64(2)(m) 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 on merit by this Court vide order
dated 06.05.2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5850 of 2025, taking
into account the fact that there being direct allegation of rape
against the petitioner, which is duly corroborated by the



statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, 2023.

4. In compliance of the order dated 03.04.2026, a report dated 17.04.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that six out of eight prosecution witnesses have been examined in this case.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 24.09.2024 without any rhymes or reason. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future, hence, petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on and is at an advance stage.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is again ***rejected*** with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of two months from today. If the trial



is not concluded within the period of two months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

