

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24207 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-388 Year-2021 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Virendra Baitha @ Birendra Baitha Son of Vindeshwar Baitha Resident of
Village- Turki, P.S.- Minapur, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 06-09-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. This is the 2nd attempt of the petitioner. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 21.07.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 39162 of 2023.

3. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Minapur P.S. Case No. 388 of 2021 registered for the offence under Sections 304(B), 201, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The following order was passed on 21.07.2023 in Cr. Misc. No. 39162 of 2023 :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Minapur P.S. Case No. 388 of 2022 registered for the offence under Sections 304B, 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the deceased has been killed by the petitioner and other co-accused within a year of marriage.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 01.12.2022.

5. Learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased.

6. I have considered the submissions of the parties.

7. Considering the allegations levelled against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. This application for bail is rejected.

9. The court below is directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the petitioner is in jail since 01.12.2022, but there is no progress in the trial.

6. The case has been committed to the Court of Sessions on 11.07.2024.

7. The petitioner is the husband of the deceased. The petitioner and other family members are alleged to have killed the deceased within one year of marriage.

8. In these circumstances, I see no ground to review my earlier order.

9. The District Judge, Muzaffarpur is directed to get the trial of the petitioner expedited considering the period of custody of the petitioner.

10. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur is directed to see to it that the witnesses are produced regularly



in the Sessions Trial after framing of charge.

11. With the aforesaid observation and direction, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

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

