

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34392 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-258 Year-2024 Thana- SANGRAMPUR District- Munger

Mantu Yadav S/o Late Hari Yadav @ Latihari Yadav R/o Village - Raikar, PS
- Sangrampur, District - Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Saurabh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 17-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T.
No. 375 of 2025 arising out of Sangrampur P.S. Case No. 258 of
2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 103(1), 115(2),
352, 76 & 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 on merit by this Court vide order
dated 19.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 36904 of 2025, taking
into account there being direct allegation against the petitioner.



4. In compliance of the order dated 15.05.2026, a report dated 21.05.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charge in this case was framed on 04.11.2025. It is further reported that out of nine (9) prosecution witnesses, no witness is examined until now. It is also reported that trial is likely to be concluded within a period of six months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 17.02.2025, without any rhymes or reason, having no criminal antecedent. 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.

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 four months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of four months, as stated



above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before
the court below.

Raj Kishore/-

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

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

