

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8721 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-356 Year-2021 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

=====

Anjan Paswan, Male, aged about 36 years, S/O Late Bahadur Paswan
(wrongly typed Hahadur in place of Bahadur in the impugned order), R/O Vil-
lage- Sultapur, Ward No. 17, P.S- Danapur, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s]: Mr. Munni Kumar Moon, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Indihar Kumari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA

ORAL ORDER

3 01-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with
Danapur P.S. Case No. 356 of 2021 registered for an offence
punishable under Sections 364 and 120(B)/34 of the Indian Pe-
nal Code.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the informant dis-
closed that his younger brother went from the house and there-
after he did not come back. The informant has suspected that the
accused persons had provided loan by the brother of the infor-
mant and on demanded to return the money they have put pres-
sure on series of occasion as well as threatened to him and
thereafter his brother became traceless.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that peti-
tioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He submits that
that there is no eye witness to the alleged occurrence and the



said FIR was lodged after five days of alleged occurrence. Petitioner has got clean antecedent as stated in para-3 of the petition and he is in custody since 19.07.2023.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. From perusal of the first information report and impugned order dated 06.12.2023, it appears that the petitioner is named in the FIR and during course of argument, it is submitted by learned counsel for the State that the trial of the petitioner is going on and total one witness has already been examined and the trial is likely to be concluded within six months, in these circumstances, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the trial Court is directed to conclude the trial preferably within a period of six months and if the trial is not concluded within the said period, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail before the trial Court.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

