

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63932 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2023 Thana- PIRO District- Bhojpur

Sandeep Singh Son of Uday Yadav @ Uday Singh Resident of Village - Chedi Tola (Jitaura), P.S. - Piro, District - Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ayodhya Singh Son of Vasid Singh Resident of Village - Kahuara, P.S. - Vikramganj, District - Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                                                     |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate<br>Mr. Kedar Yadav, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP                                             |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Raghunandan Kumar Singh, Advocate                               |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      12-12-2024                      Heard learned Senior counsel, Mr Yogesh Chandra Verma for the petitioner, the State as also the informant.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with Piro P.S. Case No. 35 of 2023 for the offence punishable under sections 304(B), 201 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code lodged on 26.01.2023 by the informant, Ayodhya Singh.

3. Though in the last rejection order passed on 26.04.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 6158 of 2024, the Court wanted the learned Trial Court to conclude the trial in three months and failure to do so, the petitioner files this petition.

4. Accordingly, a report was called for and the comprehensive report clearly shows that it was the defence side



which started taking time since 06.08.2024 submitting that they want to challenge the order dated 03.08.2024. Further, after granting time twice firstly for a fortnight and later for seven days, as no stay order came, the Court has now proceeded and according to the learned counsel for the informant, it is on the point of argument.

5. Considering the allegation that has come on the record already discussed in the earlier order coupled with the fact that the petitioner himself delayed the trial, this Court deems it fit and proper that he should wait for the conclusion of the trial.

6. The bail application stands rejected.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Adnan/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

