

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80890 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Saran

Raushan Kumar Karn S/O Dinesh Lal Karn R/O Janakpur, P.S.- Mujaulia,
District- Dhanush (Nepal).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahashweta Sinha, Inspector-cum-S.H.O., Mahila P.S- Saran Camp-
Puchhari Bazar P.S- Baniyapur, Distt.- Saran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajesh Kumar, A.P.P.

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

ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. Learned A.P.P. for the State submitted that he has
informed the informant of this case through S.H.O concern, but
no one appears on behalf of the informant.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Saran
Mahila P.S. case No. 68 of 2025, instituted for the offences
under Sections 79, 111, 141, 143, 145, 98, 296 and 3(5) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, section 13/14 of POCSO Act
and section 79 of the J.J.Act and Section 16 of the Bonded
Labour Act.

4. Allegation against the accused persons including the



petitioner is that they were caught with minor girls who were employed in the orchestra allegedly being run by the petitioner and others.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner is labourer in the orchestra. He used to arrange sound box in the orchestra. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 03.08.2025 and has no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State and vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that victim in her statement recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS has corroborated the contents of the FIR, and therefore, the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the



petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

9. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

10. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today. If any such application is filed before the learned court below, the court concerned shall consider the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

