

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71860 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-226 Year-2020 Thana- SINGHWARA District- Darbhanga

GURU SHARAN YADAV SON OF YUGAL YADAV RESIDENT OF
MOHALLA- BHAGWATI PUR, PS- SINGHWARA, DIST- DARBHANGA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Y.C. Verma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Kedar Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 01-12-2023 1. Heard learned senior counsel for the Petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Singhwara P.S. Case No. 226 of 2020, dated 20.12.2020,
registered for the offence(s) punishable under Sections 302 and
120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. This is second attempt of the petitioner for the
relief of regular bail after his earlier attempt for the said relief
was rejected by this Bench vide order dated 20.02.2023 passed
in Cr. Misc. No. 42853 of 2022 and now the petitioner, who has
been languishing in jail since 18.04.2022, has come again for
the same relief by filing the instant petition.

4. The main submissions advanced by learned senior



counsel for the petitioner are that the petitioner and co-accused Rajaram Yadav preferred Cr. Misc. No. 42853 of 2022 for the relief of regular bail which was rejected by this Bench giving liberty to the petitioner to renew his bail prayer after six months if any significant progress is not made in his trial by the prosecution and till date no significant progress has been made in the trial of the petitioner despite the charges upon the petitioner having been framed on 16.11.2022 and no prosecution witness has been examined till date.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Heard both the sides. Though, against this petitioner there is serious allegation but considering petitioner's judicial custody period and mainly the lingering attitude of the prosecution in producing and examining the prosecution witnesses despite the charges upon the petitioner having been framed on 16.11.2022 as pointed out by learned senior counsel for the petitioner, in my opinion, in the said circumstances the petitioner now deserves to the privilege of bail. Accordingly, let the petitioner named-above be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the concerned Court in



connection with Singhwara P.S. Case No. 226 of 2020.

7. Let a report be called for from the Trial Court regarding the steps taken by the Trial Court for getting the appearance of the prosecution witnesses and if the prosecution witnesses did not turn up till date despite steps having been taken by the Trial Court then what action has been taken by the Trial Court against the prosecution or concerned.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Maynaz/-

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

