

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.72275 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-279 Year-2022 Thana- ROHTAS District- Rohtas

=====

RANJAN KUMAR CHOUDHARY @ RANJAN KUMAR CHAUDHARY
S/O SRI SHANKAR CHAUDHARI R/O VILLAGE- RANJITGANJ, P.S-
AMJHOR (ROHTAS), DISTT.- ROHTAS AT SASARAM(BIHAR).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

.. ... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manish Kumar No 13, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pronoti Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 03-11-2023 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioner and Ld. APP for
the State.

2. The petitioner renews his prayer for bail in connection with Rohtas (Amjhor) P.S. Case No. 279 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 452, 290, 354(B), 354(D) and 504 of the Indian Penal Code and 37© of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

3. Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had moved this Court earlier for regular bail vide Cr. Misc. No. 57003 of 2022. However, the same was rejected vide order dated 18.01.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 57003/2022 on merit. Thereafter, the petitioner has preferred fresh bail petition before Id. Trial court and the Ld. Trial court has also rejected his fresh bail petition vide order dated 25.09.2023 on merit. As per bail order passed by the Id. Trial court it appears that out of



five prosecution witnesses only three witnesses including the victim/informant have been examined which shows that the trial is on the verge of conclusion.

4. Accordingly, this Court finds no fresh ground or circumstances so as to warrant reconsideration of the prayer of the petitioner for bail except period of custody.

5. Ld. APP for the State opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail and submits that the alleged offence is serious in nature and the petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Ld. Trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude it within three months failing which petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before this Court and in that situation the Ld. Trial court will be required to explain his or her failure to conclude the trial within the aforesaid stipulated time of three months.

7. Accordingly, the present petition for bail is rejected with the aforesaid observation.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

perwez

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

