

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.63125 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-69 Year-2015 Thana- ROH District- Nawada

Deokinandan Yadav @ Deoki Yadav Son of latge Chhotu Yadav, Resident of
Village-Garura, P.S.-Roh, Distt.-Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Manish Kumar No 13, Advocate Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate,
For the informant	:	Mr. Bikramaditya, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 02-01-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned counsel appearing for the informant and the learned

A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sessions Trial No. 11 of 2016, arising out of Roh P.S. Case No.
69 of 2015, registered under Sections 302 and 201/34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act, pending in
the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Nawada.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
bail prayer of the petitioner was refused thrice lastly on
19.07.2017 vide Criminal Miscellaneous No. 12281 of 2017
with direction to the trial Court to conclude the trial of the
petitioner, preferably, within one year by taking all effective



steps. The Charge has been framed against the petitioner on 21.05.2016, but not a single prosecution witness has been examined in this case. The petitioner is in custody since 16.08.2015.

The report, as called for, has been received to the Court of Addl. Session Judge-I, Nawada, vide letter No. 691 of 2018, dated 16.11.2018, which indicates that out of five witnesses, four Chargesheet witnesses have been examined.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to reconsider the prayer of bail of the petitioner at present. Accordingly, prayer of the petitioner for bail is rejected. However, learned Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Nawada is directed to conclude the trial of the petitioner within four months by taking all effective steps. If the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within the aforesaid period of four months, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

