

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80124 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-222 Year-2017 Thana- RAJNAGAR District- Madhubani

Rajesh Kumar Sah @ Rajesh Sah Son of Late Sarju Sah @ Saryug Sah R/o
Village - Ram Nagar Ghat Bhatra, P.S. - Bisfi, District – Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Bharti, Advocate
For the State : Mr.Jai Narain Thakur, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

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

2. This is the third attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 222/2017, registered for the offence punishable under Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier the bail applications of the petitioner were rejected twice vide orders dated 17.09.2018 and 23.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 40116 of 2018 and 21351 of 2025 respectively.

4. The following order was passed on 23.04.2025 in



Cr. Misc. No. 21351 of 2025, which reads as under:

“Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Rajnagar P.S. Case No.222 of 2017 registered for the offence under section 394 of the Indian Penal Code but cognizance has been taken under sections 392 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code. Earlier, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail had been rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 17.09.2018 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.40116 of 2018.

3. It is alleged that while the informant was going on his motorcycle, four unknown persons surrounded and assaulted him with fist and slaps and also took away his motorcycle and mobile.

4. The looted motorcycle was recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He is in custody since 25.01.2025. The petitioner is accused in six more criminal cases. He had fled away from the custody also.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected. If the trial is delayed by the prosecution, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.”

5. From the supplementary affidavit, it appears that because of non-appearance of the co-accused, charges are not being framed.

6. Considering the gravity of the offence, I find no ground to review my earlier order.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.



8. The Court below is directed to separate the case of
the petitioner and frame charge and proceed with the trial.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

