

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1852 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-217 Year-2019 Thana- BIKRAMGANJ District- Rohtas

1. RAVINDRA SINGH Son of Lalji Singh Resident of Village- Mohini, P.S.- Bikramganj, District- Rohtas.
2. Rukashad Singh Son of Dilshad Singh R/o Village- Shivrawane, P.S.- Kunda Pande, District- Muradabad (U.P.).

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr.Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sadanand Paswan, Spl. PP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

4 22-09-2021

Heard the parties in virtual Court.

This appeal is barred by limitation. The delay is explained in I.A. No. 01 of 2021, a petition under Section 5 of the Limitation Act.

Hence, for substantial justice, delay is condoned.

This is an appeal under Section 14(A)(2) of the SC/ST Act against the refusal of prayer for bail vide order dated 29.09.2020 passed by learned 7th Addl. Sessions Judge, Rohtas at Sasaram in Bikramganj P.S. Case No. 217 of 2019 registered under Sections 376/302/34 of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 4/6 of the POCSO Act and Sections 3(2)(i), 3(i)(w)(1)(ii) of the



SC/ST Act.

In the past, prayer for bail was refused on 18.03.2020 in Cr. Appeal (SJ) NO. 3999 of 2019 vide order at Anneuxre-1 as allegation was that five years old daughter of the informant was found missing and it revealed that she was playing along with the appellants. Later on her dead body was recovered in naked condition and blood was coming from her private part.

Since other witness had also stated before the police that the daughter of the informant was playing with the appellants, hence strong material was there against the appellants. Appellants are in custody since 02.05.2019.

Considering the nature and seriousness of the allegation and supporting material, I am not inclined to enlarge the appellants on bail. Hence, prayer is refused.

Trial court is directed to expedite and conclude the trial preferably within one year, failing which the trial court shall submit explanation for non-conclusion of the trial.

The State authorities including SP, Rohtas is directed to produce the prosecution witnesses before the trial Judge on each and every date fixed in the trial.

Let a copy of the order be communicated to the SP,



Rohtas.

Accordingly this appeal stands dismissed.

(Birendra Kumar, J)

mantreshwar/-

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

