

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2201 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2020 Thana- TARARI District- Bhojpur

=====

BOBI RAM @ BOBI KUMAR RAM SON OF DHARMENDRA RAM
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- DHANGAWA, POLICE STATION- TARARI,
DISTRICT- BHOJPUR. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar,Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Akhileshwar Dayal,APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER**

5 07-07-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.
Akhileshwar Dayal, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner in the present case is seeing regular bail in connection with Tarari P.S. Case No. 12 of 2020 registered for offences punishable under sections 302, 452 Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the prosecution story, the four named accused persons including the petitioner along with 10-15 unknown persons came to the house of the informant in search of his grandson, Ankit. It is further stated that they forcibly entered into the house and dragged Ankit from the house. After that one accused namely Sanni Ram caught hold Ankit's right hand, Raja Ram caught left hand and Bobi Ram (the petitioner) tilted Ankit towards back and after that the another co-accused Dharmendra fired upon the deceased.



Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that during investigation no independent witness has supported the occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 16.01.2020 having no criminal antecedent.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case wherein this Court has noticed that there is an allegation against the petitioner that he had tilted the neck of the son of the informant who was fired upon by the co-accused Dharmendra Ram and further upon finding that out of 10 witnesses mentioned in the chargesheet, four witnesses have already been examined in course of trial and the learned trial court has reported that the case is likely to be disposed of within four months, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. His prayer for bail is thus, refused.

Let the trial be expedited and all endeavours be made to conclude the trial within four months after start of normal functioning of the court. If the trial remains unconcluded within the aforesaid period for no reason attributable to the petitioner, he may renew his prayer for bail.

The application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

