

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33952 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2014 Thana- PARAIYA District- Gaya

Gaytri Paswan @ Gajendra Paswan S/O -Dudheshwar Paswan R/O- Village-
Kamaldah P.S- Paraiya, District -Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Sharma, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 25-10-2024

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The following order was passed on 26.07.2023:

*“Heard learned counsel appearing
on behalf of the petitioner and learned APP
appearing on behalf of the State.*

*The petitioner seeks bail in
connection with Paraiya P.S. Case No. 120 of
2014 registered for the offence under Sections
353, 307, 324, 326 of the Indian Penal Code
and 27 of the Arms Act.*

*As per the prosecution case the police
got information that the accused persons of
Paraiya P.S. Case No. 112 of 2014 who are
kidnappers were present in the Kamalda
village. The police raided the place of
occurrence from where the petitioner and other
accused persons started firing. Ghanshyam*



Shah was hit in the firing of the accused persons.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner the petitioner is in custody since 28.01.2023.

Though, the learned counsel for the petitioner has mentioned in his application that he has clean antecedents but in the impugned order it has come that the petitioner is also an accused in a case under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and Arms Act which clearly shows that the petitioner has suppressed the facts of the case.

Considering the suppression of the facts, serious allegation against the petitioner and also the fact that the petitioner is an absconder in case registered in the year 2014, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer of bail of the petitioner is rejected herewith.

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

3. The trial has started and one witness has already been examined.

4. In view of the fact that the trial is started, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.



5. This application is dismissed.

6. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya is directed to monitor the sessions trial so that the witnesses are regularly examined in this case.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya through FAX forthwith for the compliance of the order.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

