

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.12199 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -668 Year- 2013 Thana -BIHTA District- PATNA

=====

Babloo Sao @ Bablu Saw S/o- Ram Nandan Sah, R/v- Muslim Raghapur,
P.S- Bihta, Distt.- Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Veena Kumari Jaiswal, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 27-04-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

The petitioner is in custody since 27.01.2014 in connection with Sessions Trial No.970 of 2014 arising out of Bihta P.S. Case No. 668 of 2013/G.R.No.3090 of 2013 pending in the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-III, Danapur for the offences instituted under Sections 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3/4 of the D.P.Act.

This is the second attempt for grant of regular bail on behalf of the petitioner.

The earlier bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide Cr.Misc.No.27549 of 2015 dated 31.07.2015.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the case has not been committed to the Court of Sessions. Taking into account the said fact, the trial court was directed to take all

necessary steps to conclude the trial preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

Vide order dated 30.03.2016 a report regarding the stage of the case was called for from the court below. The said report is at flag-‘B’. From perusal of the said report, it appears that incorrect submission was made on behalf of the petitioner in the earlier bail application that the case has not been committed to the Court of Sessions. The case was committed as back as in 2014 itself and the charges were framed on 27.11.2014. Four prosecution witnesses have already been examined in the present case and non-bailable warrant has also been issued against the remaining four chargesheeted witnesses.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any fresh ground for grant of regular bail to the above named petitioner, the same is rejected.

Anyhow, the trial court is directed to take all necessary steps to conclude the trial preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this case and if the same is not concluded, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for regular bail.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

B.Kr./-

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