

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.37817 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -24 Year- 2014 Thana -SAHPUR District- BHOJPUR

=====

Chitrانjan Pandey Son of Uma Pandey @ Umo Shankar Pandey, R/o
Village- Shahpur, P.S.- Shahpur, District- Bhojpur At Ara (Bihar).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Indihar Kumari

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**
ORAL ORDER

3 30-08-2017 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned A.P.P. for the State as also the learned counsel for the

informant.

The petitioner wants to renew his prayer for bail

which was earlier rejected by order dated 02.02.2016 passed in Cr.

Misc. No. 30671 of 2015, on the ground that the petitioner is

suffering in custody since 11.07.2014, against the petitioner there

is no specific allegation, during investigation it has come that

Nikki Singh and the petitioner were seen fleeing away with the

firearm but on the person of the deceased only one injury has been

found caused by firearm and up till now only two prosecution

witnesses have been examined and in near future there is no

chance of early conclusion of the trial, further in this case Pankaj



Rai and Ravindra Sinha have already been allowed bail and as such the petitioner also deserves sympathetic consideration.

The learned A.P.P. duly assisted by the learned senior counsel for the informant opposes prayer for bail of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner and co-accuse Nikki Singh were seen with the firearm and they have shot son of the informant causing his death.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, finding no good ground for reconsideration of prayer for bail, again prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected in connection with S.T. No. 401 of 2016 arising out of Shahpur P.S. Case No. 24 of 2014 pending in the court of Additional Sessions Judge-VIth, Bhojpur at Ara.

However, the learned trial court is again directed to expedite the trial and to conclude the same preferably within four months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, failing which the petitioner, if at no fault, may be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

Abhay/-

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

