

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33652 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-237 Year-2020 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Ragho Rai @ Raghu Rai S/O Rajmangal Rai R/O Village- Hansaur, P.S.-
Belsand, Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anish Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

7 06-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Minapur P.S. Case No. 237 of 2020 for the offences registered
under Sections 399, 386, 411, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal
Code, Sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act as well as
Sections 17, 18, 19 and 20 of U.A.P. Act.

3. This regular bail has been filed by the petitioner
second time. Earlier his bail application was rejected by this
Court on merit, vide order dated 31.03.2022 passed in Cr. Misc.
No. 19827 of 2021.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is in custody since 01.07.2020 and trial has not been
progressed in this case. Accordingly, he may be granted regular
bail.



5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that bail of the petitioner was earlier rejected observing that the applicant against whom there are 12 criminal cases in respect of serious offences having checkered history of criminal cases including several crimes registered for the offence under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and the Court is not assured of the fact that after releasing on bail the applicant would not commit any further offence. He further submits that sanction has been granted to prosecute the petitioner under Sections 17, 18, 19 and 20 of U.A.P. Act on 09.05.2024.

6. It appears from the record that the Trial Court was earlier directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner but due to pending sanction order, the trial has not been proceeded.

7. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties and considering the facts that there is no fresh ground for consideration of the bail of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

rakhi/-

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

