

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42571 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1 Year-2024 Thana- DHARHARA District- Munger

Mukul Singh Son of Nilambar Singh Resident of Village -Mohanpur PS
-Dharhara District -Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 10-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 11 of 2025 arising out of Dharhara P.S. Case No. 01 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 324, 302, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. This is the third 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 18.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 56686 of 2024, and the same was challenged in the Hon'ble Apex Court which stood dismissed vide order dated 21.02.2025 passed in SLP



(Crl.) No. 1367 of 2025. Again petitioner renewed his prayer for bail before this Court which was again rejected with an observation to Trial Court to take all necessary steps to conclude the trial at earliest preferably within a period of nine months.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 05.01.2024 without any rhymes or reason, having one criminal antecedent. It is mainly submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that only three (3) out of fourteen (14) chargesheet witnesses have been examined till date now. 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.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail. Learned APP has further relied upon a decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **2024 SCC Online SC 3539 (X. vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.)**, wherein in paragraph No.14, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

“14. Ordinarily in serious offences like rape, murder, dacoity, etc., once the trial commences and the prosecution starts examining its witnesses, the Court be it the Trial Court or the High Court



*should be loath in entertaining
the bail application of the
accused.”*

6. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner, which is already decided by this Court on merit. It also appears that three (3) out of fourteen (14) chargesheet witnesses have been examined in this case.

7. 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 five (5) months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of five (5) months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajkishore/-
Sukriti/-

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

