

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24283 of 2020

Arising Out of PS Case No.-40 Year-2019 Thana- BIKRAMGANJ District- Rohtas

=====

Dhirendra Kumar Ranjan @ Sujit Kumar, aged about 23 years, Male, Son of Anil Kumar, Resident of Village-Tenduni, Dhibra, Ward no. 4, PS-Bikramganj, District - Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN
AMANULLAH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 24-02-2021

Heard Mr. Babu Nandan Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor (hereinafter referred to as the 'APP') for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with Bikramganj PS Case No. 40 of 2019 dated 20.01.2019, instituted under Sections 302, 307, 326 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. This is the second attempt for bail by the petitioner as earlier such prayer was rejected by order dated 11.12.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 46327 of 2019.

4. The allegation against the petitioner who has been made accused on the basis of confessional statement of main



accused Shambhu Pandey is that he was waiting outside the scene of crime and had taken away Shambhu Pandey on his motorcycle.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that only on the confessional statement, that too, before the police, he has been made accused and further that the second daughter of the informant who was injured has not identified or taken his name. Learned counsel submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 18.02.2019.

6. Learned APP submitted that the elder daughter of the informant was brutally stabbed to death and the younger daughter was also stabbed but she survived. It was submitted that the main accused has stated that it was the petitioner who was keeping a watch outside the scene of crime and had taken him away on his motorcycle. It was further submitted that in the trial many witnesses have been examined, as has been stated by the petitioner himself in the application and, thus, the Court below be directed to conclude the trial.

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the Court does not find any occasion to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.



9. However, as many witnesses have been examined, the Court below shall expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest, preferably within one year from the date of production of a copy of this order.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

AFR/NAFR	
U	
T	

