

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26057 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2024 Thana- PIRPAINTI District- Bhagalpur

Vikram Kumar Yadav @ Vikram Yadav Son of Ramdeo Yadav Resident of
vill.-Ramnagar, P.S.-Pirpanti, Distt.-Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vaishnavi Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Awadhesh Kumar Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5 12-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Pirpanti P.S. Case No. 02 of 2024 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections-302, 307, 504, 506, 34 of the Indian
Penal Code and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case in short is that while the informant
along with other family members were celebrating picnic on the
occasion of new year, the accused persons along with the
petitioner came there and started firing, as a result of which, the
informant's brother, Abhimanyu Kumar sustained fire-arm
injury and died. One other family member of the informant also
sustained injury.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the informant makes allegation that the petitioner was also firing and he fired at Ranjeet Yadav but Ranjeet Yadav did not support the statement of the informant. Ranjeet Yadav in his statement recorded at paragraph-34 of the case diary has stated that the co-accused Preetam Yadav had fired two shots. The first shot hit the deceased whereas the second shot hit in the leg of this witness (Ranjeet Yadav). It has further been submitted that one month after recording the statement of said Ranjeet Yadav, the statement of three witnesses at paragraphs-90, 91 & 92 of the case diary in which, they have stated that the petitioner had fired at Ranjeet Yadav.

5. On the otherhand, learned counsel appearing for the informant as well as Sri J. N. Thakur, learned counsel appearing for the State has opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the petitioner was also accompanying the other accused persons and due to election rivalry, the accused persons committed murder of one of the family members of the informant whereas in the occurrence, one person sustained fire-arm injury. The petitioner is a person of criminal antecedent.

6. The report was called for from the court below regarding status of the case and expected time for conclusion of



the trial.

7. The trial court has reported that there is possibility of conclusion of trial within a period of six months.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the learned court below is directed to conclude the trial within a period of six months and if, the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within the aforesaid period of six months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

9. With the aforesaid observation, this application stands rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

A.K.V.//-

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

