

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64211 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-324 Year-2019 Thana- GAIGHAT District- Muzaffarpur

ARUN SAHNI Son of Sita Ram Sahani Resident of Village - Ramdas  
Majhauri, P.S.- Bochahan, Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anish Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Prasad Nat

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA  
ORAL ORDER**

3      22-12-2021                      Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned  
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with  
Gaighat Police Station Case No. 324 of 2019, registered for the  
offences punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal  
Code.

This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner  
for grant of regular bail. Earlier, the prayer for regular bail of the  
petitioner was rejected by this Court, vide order, dated  
04.11.2020, passed in Criminal Misc. No. 23093 of 2020, giving  
liberty to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after nine  
months from the date of the order, if the trial does not show any  
progress.

The allegation, as per the First Information Report, is



that the brother of the informant, Ranjit Pandit was working at Toll Plaza and on 16.09.2019, he had gone to the Toll Plaza but did not return till midnight. In the morning, when the informant started searching his brother, he found the dead body of his brother at Karichak Mor. It has further been alleged that Glamour Motorcycle and a golden chain of the brother of the informant were also looted by the unknown criminals by killing his brother.

This Court, vide order, dated 17.11.2021, had called for a report from the learned Court below regarding the stage of the case and in pursuance of the said order, a report has been submitted by learned 9<sup>th</sup> Additional Sessions Judge, Muzaffarpur, and from perusal of the same, it would be evident that the case is fixed for evidence and altogether seven chargesheeted witnesses, excluding the doctor, who has conducted post-mortem examination report, are yet to be examined in the trial.

After having heard learned Counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that the trial is fixed for evidence, I am not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his



prayer for bail after six months from today, if the trial does not  
show any progress.

Prabhakar Anand/-

**(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)**

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| U | ✓ | T | ✓ |
|---|---|---|---|

