

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2025 Thana- MAHILA P.S District- West Champaran

Ravi Ranjan Choube @ Ravi Ranjan Choubey S/O Raju Choubey @ Raju  
Chaube R/O Village- Gurha, Ward- 12, Post- Pipra, P.S- Govindganj, District-  
East Champaran Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. X W/O Girish Prasad The officer-in-charge, Bettiah Mahila P.S- Bettiah  
Town, Dist- West Champaran , Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mayank Mohan, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3      11-03-2026              Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP  
for the State. Despite valid issuance of notice, none appears for  
the informant.

2.      The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bettiah  
Mahila P.S. Case No. 08 of 2025 instituted for the offences  
under Sections 64, 65(1), 143(1), 145, 98 & 3(5) of the  
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Sections 6, 8 & 12 of the  
POCSO Act and Sections 75 & 79 of the J.J. Act and Sections 3,  
4, 5 & 6 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act and Sections  
16, 17 & 18 of the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act.

3.      This is the second 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 13.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 31511 of 2025, taking into account the nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence and involvement of the petitioner in the offence.

4. In compliance of the order dated 17.01.2026, a report dated 12.02.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that two (2) out of nineteen (19) charge sheet witnesses have been examined in this case. It is further reported that trial is likely to be concluded within a period of nine months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 23.02.2025 without any rhymes or reason, having no criminal antecedent. 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.

6. 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.”*

7. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on.

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

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

Raj Kishore/-

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

