

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44751 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2020 Thana- DAUDNAGAR District- Aurangabad

RAJDEO YADAV @ RAJDEO SINGH, Son of Late Chanrik Yadav Resident
of Village - Karmahi, P.S.- Daudnagar, Distt.- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Asha Devi, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 11-04-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P.
for the State.

Let the defect(s) be removed within two weeks of the
complete start of the physical Court in normal course.

The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Daudnagar P.S. Case No. 136 of 2020, registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 341, 323, 354 & 302/34 of the Indian
Penal Code, pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial
Magistrate, Aurangabad.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 11.04.2020,
while husband of the informant was working in his field, meanwhile,
accused persons named in the F.I.R. including the petitioner assaulted
her husband by means of lathi. Thereafter, her husband was rushed to
Daudnagar Hospital from where he was referred to P.M.C.H. for
better treatment. She further alleged that on 30.04.2020, during
treatment, her husband succumbed to his injuries.



Considering nature of allegation made against the petitioner and other co-accused that they have assaulted the husband of informant during the period of complete lock-down , the informant has to face consequence such tragedy and she has to keep her husband without treating in absence of bed at any of the hospital. This Court is of the opinion that during the complete lock-down all the hospitals were fully occupied by Covid-19 patient and it was very difficult for a common citizen to be provided with proper medical care, there was complete lock-down, which led the deceased to remain at his home circumstances were such that led to lodge the F.I.R. after delay, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, at this stage. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of regular bail is rejected.

However, the learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously, well within a period of six months. If no substantial progress takes place in trial, the petitioner, if so advised, may renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

manish/-

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

