

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.57711 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -174 Year- 2016 Thana -WARISNAGAR District- SAMASTIPUR

=====

Arjun Paswan, S/o Late Mahesh Paswan, R/o Village- Labhatta, P.S.-
Warisnagar, District- Samastipur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar Roy

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Lakshmi Kant Sharma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 28-02-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner is accused in connection with
Sessions Trial No. 42 of 2017 and 102 of 2017, arising out of
Warisnagar P.S. Case No. 174 of 2016 registered under Sections
120(B) and 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court
of Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Samastipur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
prayer for bail of the petitioner, who happens to be the father-in-
law of the deceased, was earlier rejected on merit vide order dated
14.07.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 27269 of 2017 by this Court
and petitioner is in custody since 15.07.2016. It is further
submitted that similarly situated co-accused, Dilip Paswan @



Dilip Kumar Paswan, have already been granted pre-arrest bail by a Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.08.2017 passed in Criminal Misc. No. 35569 of 2017.

A report regarding the present stage of trial has been received through letter no. 39 dated 30.01.2018, from the court of 6th Additional Sessions Judge, Samastipur, which shows that out of nine charge sheeted witnesses, two witnesses have already been examined.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, I find no ground to reconsider the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner stands rejected. However, the trial court is directed to conclude the trial of the petitioner within six months by taking all effective steps. If the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within aforesaid period of six months, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Bhardwaj/-

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

