

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.6411 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -321 Year- 2014 Thana -JAMUI District- JAMUI

=====

Triloki Yadav, Son of Bhikhari Yadav, Resident of Village -Rajpura, P.S
and District- Jamui.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Indu Kumari Srivastava(APP)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-04-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. representing the

State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Jamui
P.S. Case No. 321 of 2014 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 302 and 149 of the Indian
Penal Code.

Allegedly, on the alarm being raised by Bideshi
Yadav, the informant went near his father, who was lying injured
and the father of the informant in injured condition disclosed the
names of six persons namely (1) Ganauri Yadav, (2) Gorelal
Yadav, (3) Karu Yadav, (4) Sushil Yadav, (5) Triloki Yadav
(Petitioner) and (6) Sunil Yadav and stated that they all assaulted

him. Ishwar Yadav and Lutan Yadav also received injury.

The submission is of false implication and that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner, injured and deceased were habitual drinkers and they got injury due to fall, out of whom one died, Lutan Yadav and Ishwar Yadav both have been examined as P.W.1 and P.W.2 in Sessions Trial No. 92 of 2015 and both have turned hostile and as such, the petitioner deserves sympathetic consideration, to which the learned A.P.P. duly assisted by the learned counsel for the informant opposes by submitting that the father of the informant who died later on, disclosed the name of the petitioner also and postmortem report and the injury report show that the face of the deceased was smashed and prayer of bail of similarly situated co-accused Sunil Yadav has already been rejected.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, at this stage, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, his such prayer of bail stands rejected. However, the trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within nine months.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J.)

Amit/-

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