

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52061 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2020 Thana- LAXMIPUR District- Jamui

- 
1. Shankar Yadav. Son of Late Shibu Yadav.
  2. Tapeswar Yadav. Son of Late Shibu Yadav.
  3. Patrika Yadav. Son of Late Chhotan Yadav.
  4. Ullu Yadav @ Rajendra Yadav. Son of Late Chhotan Yadav.
  5. Mahendra Yadav @ Karu Yadav. Son of Late Chhotan Yadav.
  6. Kinu Yadav. Son of Late Chhotan Yadav.
- All are Resident of Village - Mangrar Tola Chaudiha, P.S.- Laxmipur, Distt.- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Prakash Parasar, Adv.  
For the Informant : Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Adv.

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      01-04-2022                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as also Mr. Amrendra Kumar who is appearing on behalf of the informant through video conferencing.

The petitioners are in judicial custody in connection with Laxmipur P.S. Case No.162 of 2019 instituted under Sections 147, 148, 149, 324 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the FIR, the informant has alleged that on 15.06.2020, he had gone to tend his cattle. It is further alleged that altogether sixteen accused persons including the petitioners herein who were variously armed injured his father and also tried to assault the informant. The informant fled away and it is



further alleged that later the injured father was taken firstly to the police station and then to the hospital where finally he succumb to the injuries.

The counsel for the petitioners submits that an omnibus allegation has been levelled against all the accused persons and no specific act has been assigned to any of the petitioners herein.

The counsel for the informant submits that altogether four witnesses have been examined in this case and only two witnesses remained. The trial is going to conclude very soon and as such, at this juncture the petitioners do not deserve bail.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that for the two witnesses which the informant is referring to adjournments are being made since last seven months and they are still to be examined.

Considering the gravity of the case as also the fact that the trial has now entered in the final stage, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of bail to the petitioners herein, which is accordingly dismissed.

The trial court is directed to expedite the trial and ensure that without plausible reason, no adjournment should be made. It is expected that the case will be taken to its logical



conclusion by the trial court at an earliest.

The bail application stands rejected with the aforesaid observations.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Prakash Narayan /-

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

