

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No. 1599 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-193 Year-2019 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

UDAY VERMA @ UDAY KUMAR VERMA S/O LATE JAGDISH
BHAGAT R/O VILLAGE-BHARAUNDHA, P.S.-GURUA, DISTRICT-
GAYA.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Binay Krishna, Spl. P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH

ORAL ORDER

2 25-08-2021 The instant case has been taken up for consideration
through the mode of Video conferencing in view of the
prevailing situation on account of COVID 19 Pandemic,
requiring social distancing.

Heard the learned counsel for the appellant and Sri
Binay Krishna, learned Spl. P.P. for the State.

The present appeal is directed against the order dated
20.02.2020, passed by the learned Exclusive Special Judge,
SC/ST, Gaya in B.P. No. 93 of 2020, arising out of Amas PS
case no. 193 of 2019, registered under Section 302 and other
allied sections of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3(2)(v) of



the SC/ST Act, whereby and whereunder the learned court below has rejected the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail.

It would not be out of place to mention here that this Court, by a detailed and well-considered order dated 29.06.2020, passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) no. 1211 of 2020 had rejected the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail.

The case of the prosecution in brief is that the husband of the informant had gone to the house of the appellant on 16.10.2019 and on the next day i.e. on 17.10.2019, the husband of the informant is stated to have gone with the appellant to Amas Bazar P.S. Hamzapur on his motorcycle. It is further alleged that on 17.10.2019, at about 2:00 in the afternoon, the appellant informed the informant that his husband had gone somewhere from that place and the appellant had returned to his house on a tempo. Subsequently, search was made for the husband of the informant, however, he could not be traced.

The learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the appellant is languishing in custody since 11.11.2019, charges have also been framed on 08.04.2021 and the co-accused persons have already been granted bail by



co-ordinate Benches of this Court, hence the petitioner be granted the privilege of bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the materials on record as also the earlier order passed by this Court dated 29.06.2020, from which it is apparent that a detailed and an exhaustive order was passed by this Court, after threadbare analysis of the materials on record including the case diary and this Court had come to the conclusion that the complicity of the petitioner herein, in the alleged crime, is writ large, hence this Court had dismissed the appeal. Moreover, there is no change in circumstance from the day, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail was rejected earlier vide order dated 29.06.2020, till date, hence there is no occasion to reconsider the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail, thus the present petition stands dismissed.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

rinkee/-

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

