

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86292 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2024 Thana- RAMGARH District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Rahul Kumar, S/O Kanhaiya Ram R/O Village- Sultanpur, P.S- Ramgarh,
Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjay Ram S/O Bihari Ram R/O Village- Sultanpur, P.O- Upari, P.S-
Ramgarh, Distt.- Kaimur at Bhabua.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Tribhuwan Narayan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Upendra Kumar, A.P.P.

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

ORAL ORDER

3 09-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with POCSO
Case No. 92 of 2025, arising out of Ramgarh P.S. Case No. 47
of 2024, instituted for the offences under Sections 366(A) of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier vide order dated 02.04.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 74839 of 2024, regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected by this Court considering the nature and gravity of the
offence with a direction to the learned Court below to expedite
the trial.

4. In compliance of the order dated 12.12.2025, a report
dated 22.12.2025 with regard to the present stage of trial has
been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears



that charge has been framed u/s 376(1) and 366 of I.P.C. and u/s 6 of the POCSO against the petitioner. It is further reported that there is nine witness in this case and till date no witness has been produced by the prosecution.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 01.09.2024 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/-

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

