

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.51474 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -14 Year- 2016 Thana -PURAINI District- MADHEPURA

=====

Ranjeet Goswami Son of Late Gulten Goswami @ Late Gulteni Goswami,
resident of Village- Dumrail, P.S. Puraini, District Madhepura.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

with

Criminal Miscellaneous No.2877 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -14 Year- 2016 Thana -PURAINI District- MADHEPURA

- =====
1. Sanjeet Goswami, S/o Late Gulteni Goswami resident of Village -
Dumrail, P.S.- Puraini, District- Madhepura.
 2. Niraj Goswami, S/o Shri Lakhan Goswami, resident of Village-
Hasanpur, P.S. and District- Munger.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

(In Cr.Misc. No.51474 of 2016)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anant Kumar

(In Cr.Misc. No.2877 of 2017)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anant Kumar-1

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satya Nand Shukla

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 20-03-2017

Cr. Misc. No.51474 of 2017 (Regular Bail)

Heard the parties.

This application has been filed in connection with Puraini
P.S.Case No.14 of 2016 for the offence under Sections 326 and
307 of the Indian Penal Code.



It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the informant in her statement has not stated anything about this petitioner rather she has stated about two persons, namely, Sita Devi and Gunesh Yadav as the witnesses but during the course of investigation, these persons have not been examined and later on, she has named the petitioner as the main assailant upon the injured but other witnesses in the investigation has not named the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 03.03.2016.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides and in view of the fact that the injured person has named the petitioner as the main assailant, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, however as the petitioner is in custody for about one year, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and try to conclude it within a period of nine months and if not concluded, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, which will be considered by the learned court below on its own merit on the basis of materials available on the record at that time.

With the aforesaid observation, this application is dismissed.

Cr. Misc. No.2877 of 2017 (Anticipatory Bail)

Heard the parties.

This application is for grant of anticipatory bail in



connection with Puraini P.S.Case No.14 of 2016,G.r. No.126 of 2016 for the offence under Sections 326 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that except allegation that the petitioners were accompanied the main assailant, Ranjeet Goswami and there is nothing against the petitioners.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides and from perusal of the case diary & other materials, it appears that the petitioners were accompanied the main accused at the time of firing by the other accused persons on the injured, causing injury to the injured person and secondly, as the petitioners and others were threatening the injured from before

Considering the aforesaid aspects of the matter, this not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail rather the petitioners would surrender before the learned court below and make prayer for regular bail, which will be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

chn/-



U			
---	--	--	--

