

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11777 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-465 Year-2020 Thana- SHERGHATI District- Gaya

=====

Krishna Sudama Thakur S/o Jai Ram Thakur Vill. - Bengalidih, P.S. - Sherghati, (Dobhi), Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Javed Jafar Khan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 12-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P.

for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant.

2.The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sherghati (Dobhi) P.S. Case No. 465/2020 registered for the offences punishable under section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3.As per prosecution case, the petitioner and others are said to have poured kerosene oil on the body of informant's sister and set her on fire and during the course of treatment she died.

4.Learned counsel of the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 05.01.2021 and bears no criminal antecedent . The bail of the petitioner has already been rejected on 13.01.2023 vide criminal miscellaneous no. 33289 of 2022 with a



direction that if trial is not concluded within nine from date of receipt of order the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail. On the basis of said direction petitioner has renewed his bail prayer after more after than one year and seven months. He further submits that delay of trial is not in any way attributable to the petitioner as the petitioner is in custody since 05.01.2021.

5.The learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner by submitting that bail prayer of petitioner has already been rejected bail on merit on 13.01.2023 criminal miscellaneous no. 33289 of 2022 and hence, he does not deserve bail.

6.A report regarding stage of trial has been sought by this court and in pursuance of the said direction, the trial court vide letter no. 113 dated 19.06.2024 indicates that doctor has already been examined and necessary summons have been issued against chargesheeted witnesses. The aforesaid report further reveals that the trial court has sought six months time for concluding the trial.

7.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and material available on record I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer of the bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8.The trial court is directed to conclude the trial within



five months from the date of receipt/production of copy of this order.
However, if the trial is not concluded within five months, petitioner
may renew the prayer for bail.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

krishnakant/-

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

