

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12094 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2021 Thana- CHERIYA BARIYARPUR District-  
Begusarai

=====

DILIP SAHNI Son of Late Ram Badan Sahni Resident of Village- Manjhaul,  
P.S.- Cheriabariyarpur, District- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                   |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Shubhesh Pandey, Advocate     |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, APP  |
| For the Informant    | : | Mr. Braj Bhushan Poddar, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY**

ORAL ORDER

- 5      19-07-2023                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.
2. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail in  
connection with Sessions Trial no.629 of 2021 (arising out of  
Cheriya Bariyarpur P.S. Case no.26 of 2021) registered under  
sections 366, 367, 368, 370 and 371 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The earlier prayer for bail of the petitioner was  
rejected vide order dated 9.5.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. no.55276  
of 2021.
4. As per the prosecution case, it is stated that under  
a false promise, the petitioner took away the wife of the  
informant and sold her to a human trafficking gang for the  
purpose of prostitution.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no



incriminating material has transpired against the petitioner in course of investigation. He has been falsely implicated in the case due to oblique reasons. No material has transpired against him even in course of the trial. He is in custody since 1.4.2021 and undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

6. The prayer for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the material on record including the deposition of the prosecution witness nos.1, 2 and 3 which has been brought on record in the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner, the categorical statements therein that it was the petitioner who took away the wife of the informant and since then she is traceless together with the trial having proceeded, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

8. Learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and to conclude the same at the earliest preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of this order.

**(Partha Sarthy, J)**

Saurabh/-

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

