

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18698 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-111 Year-2020 Thana- BAIKUNTHPUR District- Gopalganj

Roshan Kumar Singh@ Raushan Kumar Singh @ Rawsan Kumar Singh @
Raushan Singh Son Of Late Paras Singh Resident Of Village- Reotith Garh,
Ps- Baikunthpur, Dist- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Avinash Chandra, Advocate Mr. Sarvattam Anand, Advocate Mr. Saurabh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Kumar Veerendra Narayan, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Siyaram Pandey, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

- 3 10-04-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.
2. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of
regular bail in connection with Baikunthpur P.S. Case no. 111 of
2020 registered under sections 304B and 34 of the Indian Penal
Code and sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.
3. The earlier application for bail of the petitioner
was rejected on three occasions, the last being vide order dated
28.6.2023.
4. The petitioner happens to be the husband of the
deceased.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case only on the ground of his being the husband of the deceased. In spite of him being in custody for almost about four years since 14.5.2020, the trial has still not concluded and there is no chance of the same concluding in the near future. Learned counsel for the petitioner has taken the Court through the deposition of the prosecution witnesses to submit that there are vital contradictions in their statement. It is further submitted that taking the contents of the depositions of the witnesses including that of the doctor, there is no chance of the conviction of the petitioner and thus he be enlarged on bail. He undertakes to cooperate in the trial and to abide by the conditions which may be laid by the Court for his release on bail.

6. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that not only the petitioner is the husband of the deceased but the cause of death is said to be as a result of injuries caused by hard and blunt object. The prosecution evidence has been closed and the trial is near completion.

7. A report was called for from the learned trial Court. As per the report received contained in letter dated 22.3.2024



from the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-XII, Civil Court, Gopalganj, the prosecution evidence has been closed on 21.3.2024 and the case is fixed for recording of the statement of the accused under section 313 of the Cr.P.C.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner who happens to be husband of the deceased, the cause of death and the trial having neared conclusion with closure of the prosecution evidence, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

9. Taking into consideration the petitioner having remained in custody since 14.5.2020, the learned trial Court is directed to conclude the trial expeditiously and preferably within a period of 3 months of closure of the defence witnesses.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Harsh/-

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

