

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25934 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2024 Thana- SALIMPUR District- Patna

Jogendra Ravidas @ Jogindra Ravida @ Jogindra Mochi @ Jogendar Ravidas
S/o Rajendra Mochi R/o Village -Benipur, PS- Salimpur, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Suraj Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nityanand Tiwary, A.P.P.

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

ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Nityanand Tiwary, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T. No.
594 of 2025, arising out of Salimpur P.S. Case No. 17 of 2024
instituted for the offences under Sections 279, 304(A), 302 and
120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier, on two occasions, vide order dated 28.10.2024
passed in Cr. Misc. No. 46979 of 2024 and vide order dated
19.08.2025 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 43100 of
2025, regular bail of the petitioner were rejected by this Court
considering the nature of accusation and the gravity of the
offence with a liberty to renew the prayer after six months if the
trial is not concluded.

4. In compliance of the order dated 17.04.2026, a report



dated 23.04.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that out of fifteen prosecution witnesses, eleven witnesses have been examined in this case, four witnesses were given up on the request of prosecution and the evidence of one witness was also closed after following all procedures and thereafter the case was fixed on 02.05.2026 for recording statement of accused u/s 351 of the BNSS. It is further reported that the trial of the case would be completed within three months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 28.01.2024 without any rhymes or reason. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

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

7. There is no fresh 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)

manish/-

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

