

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87196 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2024 Thana- BUDHUCHAK District- Bhagalpur

Bambam Singh Son of Shatrughan Singh @ Satrudhan Singh Resident of
Mohalla- Goghatta, P.S.- Budhuchak, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Batia Devi W/o Ram Swaroop Singh R/o Mohalla- Ganghatta, P.S.-
Budhuchak, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subodh Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar, A.P.P.

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

ORAL ORDER

7 08-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with POCSO
Case No.99 of 2024, arises out of Budhuchak P.S Case No. 21
of 2024, instituted for the offences under Sections 376, 120(B),
504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 4 and 17 of the
POCSO Act.

3. Earlier, vide order dated 18.02.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 81572 of 2024, regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected by this Court considering the nature and gravity of the
offence, there being direct and specific allegation against the
petitioner as also taking into consideration the statement of the



minor victim girl recorded under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

4. In compliance of the order dated 10.04.2026, a report dated 22.04.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charge has been framed on 18.07.2025. The victim has been examined on 21.01.2026. It is further reported that out of seven Charge-sheeted witnesses, one witness has been examined.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 20.08.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no fresh 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 five months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of five months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before



the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Manish/ Sukriti

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

