

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7442 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-100 Year-2021 Thana- UDAKISHUNGANJ District-
Madhepura

ANURANJAN SINGH @ SINTU SINGH S/o Prabhakar Singh R/o Village-
Naya Nagar, P.S.- Udakishunganj, Distt- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Murli Dhar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 26-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of
bail in a case registered under sections 302 and 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

The earlier application for bail of the petitioner was
rejected vide order dated 10.5.2022 (Annexure-1) passed in Cr.
Misc. no.54933 of 2021.

As per the prosecution case, it is stated that the
petitioner was married to the sister of the informant. They had
four issues out of the wedlock. The informant received
information about his sister having been burnt by pouring petrol
on her. On reaching the hospital, the informant found his sister



in a burnt condition being treated in a private clinic. She was referred to another hospital but died on way to the hospital.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case only on account of his being the husband of the deceased. He is in custody since 7.4.2021. There is no chance of the trial concluding in the near future. There is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence. From the F.I.R. itself, it would transpire that the deceased was taken to the private hospital for treatment. There has been no complaint against the petitioner in the past. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner happens to be the husband of the deceased. There is direct allegation against the petitioner and other accused persons of having tortured and assaulted the deceased. The trial in the case has proceeded and the witnesses examined have supported the prosecution case. Learned counsel for the informant lastly submits that all the remaining witnesses on behalf of the prosecution will be examined in the next three months.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and



taking into consideration the nature of allegation against the petitioner who happens to be the husband of the deceased, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected for the present.

The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and to conclude the same within a period of four months from the date of communication of this order.

The petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the learned trial Court itself on completion of the period of four months, which if he filed, shall be considered without being prejudiced by this order of rejection.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

