

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.2083 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-426 Year-2018 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

Narendra Singh @ Narendra Kumar Singh @ Bihari @ Chhotu, S/o Shivaji Singh @ Shiv Narayan Singh Resident of Village- Khairwa Khurd, P.S.- Majorganj, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mrs. Usha Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

3 09-04-2021 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned counsel for the State.

This appeal has been filed against the order dated 10.02.2020 passed by learned 1st Additional Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge (POCSO Act), Sitamarhi in Trial No. 121 of 2019 arising out of Majorganj P.S. Case No. 426/2018, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 376, 341, 323, 504 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 (r) (s) (w) (i) (ii) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act as well as Section 6/8 of POCSO Act by which the prayer of the appellant for grant of bail has been rejected.

The allegation against the appellant is to have established sexual relationship with the victim/informant on the assurance of marriage and when she became pregnant, he resiled



from his assurance.

Earlier the appellant had moved before this Court for grant of bail vide Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 2217 of 2019, which was dismissed vide order dated 02.07.2019.

A co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.02.2021 has called for a report regarding stage of Sessions Trial No. 121 of 2019 and in pursuance of that order, a report dated 15.03.2021 has been received from where it appears that out of eight prosecution witnesses, four witnesses have already been examined and due to Covid-19, rest witnesses could not be examined.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is rejected.

However, the trial court is directed to conclude the trial preferably within six months after the restoration of normal court proceeding.

With this observations/directions, this appeal is dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

