

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35109 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2006 Thana- TURKAULIYA District- East Champaran

RAMBHU PASWAN son of Late Chandrika Paswan Village- Semra Khas
Hodi tola Ps- Turkauliya Dist- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhannjay Kumar No 2, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nagendra Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 12-07-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner is an accused in connection with
Turkauliya P.S. Case No. 77 of 2006 arising out of S.Tr. No. 295
of 2023 registered for the offences under sections 147, 148, 149,
447, 341, 323, 324, 325, 326, 302 and 504 of the Indian Penal
Code lodged on 11.04.2006 by the informant, Ranjeet Pawan.

The prosecution case, in brief , as stated in the written
application of the informant is that his father was sitting at his
door after taking meal, at about 8:00 PM in the night the
petitioner alongwith other accused persons armed variously
came there and started assaulting him with fists and slaps. Co-



accused Chandrika Paswan gave order to kill him and on his order all the accused persons took him away to the wheat field and assaulted him. When informant's brother Raju Paswan went there to rescue his father, the accused persons also assaulted him. Co-accused Raghav Paswan assaulted the father of the informant by means of 'barchhi'. As a result, his father died on the spot. Accordingly, the FIR.

It has been contended by the learned Counsel for the petitioner that omnibus allegation has been made against all the accused persons including the petitioner herein of armed variously assaulted the father of the informant who subsequently died.

Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, submits that a bare perusal of the FIR would show it is of the year 2006 and the petitioner has walked into judicial custody after long 16 years.

Taking into account the kind of allegation and the delay which the petitioner took to take the judicial course, this Court is not inclined to extend him privilege of bail, which is accordingly rejected.

Considering the fact that the matter is of 2006, the Trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial and conclude the



same preferably within a period of one year.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Neha/-

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

