

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.7081 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -75 Year- 2016 Thana -KATEYA District- GOPALGANJ

=====

Ramjee Yadav S/o Late Munar Yadav Resident of Village - Rampur Kalan,
Tola Kapardhik, P.S. - Kateya, District - Gopalganj.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Dwivedi, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mukeshwar Dayal, APP.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-03-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kateya
P.S. Case No. 75 of 2016 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 326, 307, 379 and
504 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that
as per the F.I.R, it is alleged that the petitioner has assaulted
Kamlesh Yadav thrice by farsa. During the course of investigation,
it has come that Kamlesh Yadav sustained only one injury but it
was found grievous in nature. Further, there is a counter case filed
by the petitioner also in which three persons received injury from
the side of the petitioner, which is evident from Anenxure-5 to this



petition. It is further submitted that the disputed land belongs to the petitioner for which there is a dispute between the parties.

It appears from Annexure-4 that the Anchal Amin conducted spot enquiry and submitted a report stating that the disputed land belongs to the informant.

Heard the learned APP also as well as the learned counsel for the informant. They have opposed the prayer of bail stating that the injury received by Kamlesh Yadav was found grievous in nature and as per the report of the Anchal Amin, the disputed land belongs to the informant and it is the case that the petitioner entered into the house of the informant and assaulted.

Having heard both sides, in view of the submissions of the parties, at this stage, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and try to conclude it within a period of six months and if the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the court below itself.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed at this stage.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J.)

Mishra/-

U			
---	--	--	--

