

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79550 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-164 Year-2022 Thana- BARARI District- Katihar

Sri Kant Singh, Son of Yogendra Prasad Singh, R/O Vill.- Dahara, P.S.-
Barari, Dist.- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ravi Kant Mandal, Son of Shasi Kant Mandal R/O Vill.- Dahara, P.S.-
Barari, Dist.- Katihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satya Narayan Yadav, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 22-11-2024 1. Heard Mr. Satya Narayan Yadav, learned counsel
for the petitioner and Mr. Yogendra Kumar, learned APP for the
State.

2. Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Barari P.S. Case No. 164 of 2022 dated 11.06.2022 registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 307, 504, 506
and 302 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. As per the prosecution, the informant alleged that
this petitioner shot his father at his neck and later on, due to the
said gun shot, the informant's father succumbed to his injury
during the course of treatment.



4. The main submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner are that this is the second attempt of the petitioner to get the relief of regular bail as his earlier bail prayer was rejected by this Bench vide order dated 27.04.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 70168/2022 with giving him a liberty to renew his bail prayer after a period of one and half year, if his trial is not concluded in the said period and in view of this liberty, the petitioner has again come before this Court as his trial is still running, though the trial is now running for recording the defence evidence of this petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 17.06.2022 and the prosecution's case is based on the evidence of the informant but he is not an eyewitness of the alleged occurrence.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner and submits that it will not be proper to enlarge this petitioner on bail at this stage as his trial is at the verge of end.

6. Heard both the sides. Though the petitioner has come again for the relief of regular bail in the light of the liberty granted to him in his earlier prayer but as per the above submission, his trial is at the verge of end and presently running



for recording his defence evidence, so, it will not be proper to enlarge him on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the second bail prayer of the petitioner stands rejected.

7. The trial court is directed to conclude the trial of this petitioner in the next two months from the receipt of this order.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

annu/-

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

