

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1620 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-294 Year-2025 Thana- DEEPNAGAR District- Nalanda

Navlesh Mahto @ Naulesh Kumar @ Naulesh Prasad S/O late Genori Mahto
@ late Ganori Prasad R/O Village- Dumarawan, P.S.- Deepnagar, Dist.-
Nalanda

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sushila Devi W/O Om Prakash Paswan R/O Village- Dumarawan, P.S.-
Deepnagar, Dist.- Nalanda

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mrs. Usha Kumari 1, SPP Mr. Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

4 17-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned counsel
for the informant and learned SPP for the State.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 17.03.2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Vith-cum-Special Judge, SC/ST, Nalanda at Bihar Sharif whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Deep Nagar P.S. Case No. 294 of 2025 under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 103(1), 61(2), 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 27, 35 of the



Arms Act and Sections 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. Earlier, vide order dated 22.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 4102 of 2025, regular bail of the appellant was rejected by this Court considering the nature and gravity of offence.

4. In compliance of the order dated 08.05.2026 a report dated 10.06.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that out of ten charge-sheeted witnesses, seven witnesses have been examined in this case.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is languishing in judicial custody since 08.07.2025 without any rhymes or reason and he has no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned SPP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no fresh ground to consider the bail petition of the appellant.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the appellant is again rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same in an expeditious



manner.

9. Accordingly, the present appeal stands dismissed.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

