

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68733 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-65 Year-2015 Thana- AMAS District- Gaya

=====

Dhiru Yadav @ Dhanukdhari Yadav @ Dhiraj Yadav @ Dhanush Dhiraj @
Dhanuk @ Dhanukdh Yadav S/o Bangali Yadav R/o Village- Bankar
Paharpur, PS- Amas, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate
Ms. Sakshi Deep, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 03-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.
No. 603/2023, 1341/2023 arising out of Amas P.S. Case No. 65
of 2015 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 147, 148,
149 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act
and Section 17 of C.L.A. Act.

3. Earlier the application for regular bail of the
petitioner was thrice rejected *vide* orders dated 17-03-2020,
28-01-2022 & 04-09-2023, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 77797 of
2019, Cr. Misc. No. 19911 of 2021 & Cr. Misc. No. 57117 of
2022, respectively.



4. In pursuance to the direction of this Court, a report dated 17-10-2024, with regard to the present stage of trial has been received to this Court and it is reported that out of thirteen charge sheet witnesses, six are examined and seven witnesses are yet to be examined for which non-bailable warrant was issued and it is further reported that trial is likely to be concluded within a period of six months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 29-06-2019 and there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future.

6. Learned APP for the State, on the other hand has fervently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner stating that petitioner is notorious person having eighteen (18) criminal antecedents, as such, he does not deserve the privilege of grant of regular bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court does not find any fresh ground for reconsideration of the matter as the same is already decided thrice by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on merits. Hence, considering the advance stage of trial which is likely to be concluded within a period of six months, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer is accordingly *rejected*.



8. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

