

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15897 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-229 Year-2019 Thana- BARHARA KOTHI District- Purnia

RAM KUMAR @ SHRIRAM SINGH @ RAM SINGH Son of Late Shiv
Shankar Singh R/v- Bhatotar, P.S.- Barhara, District- Purnea

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mrgank Mauli, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Samir Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-04-2023 Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 01.12.2021 in Cr. Misc. No. 33906 of 2021. It is next submitted that by the said order, liberty was granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after one year. It is further submitted that the petitioner has remained in custody for nearly more than two and a half years as the petitioner is in custody since 23.12.2020.

The learned Senior counsel next submits that the order dated 01.12.2021 in Cr. Misc. No. 33906 of 2021 in detail recorded the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner to



show his innocence. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the trial has commenced and out of seven witnesses, five witnesses have already been examined and only the I.O. and the Doctor remain to be examined.

The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the bail application of the petitioner and submits that since the trial has commenced and is on the verge of conclusion as such for the present, the Court should not exercise its jurisdiction for granting bail to the petitioner rather the learned trial court be directed to expedite the trial.

Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

His prayer for bail is thus rejected.

However, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

In the event, if the trial is not concluded within the period as indicated hereinabove, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before the learned trial court itself and if the learned trial court comes to a conclusion that for



no fault of the petitioner, the trial could not be completed, the learned trial court without being influenced by this order shall take an independent decision.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishi-II/-

U			
---	--	--	--

