

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.685 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-252 Year-2021 Thana- FATEHPUR District- Gaya

CHANDRADEO YADAV @ CHANDRADEV YADAV S/O- VISHU
YADAV @ BISHUN YADAV R/O- VILLAGE- MODANBIGHA (MEYARI
TOLA). P.S.- FATEHPUR, DIST.- GAYA.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhaskar Shankar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 09-02-2024 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with Fatehpur P.S. Case No. 252 of 2021 for the offence under section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code lodged on 07.08.2021 by the informant, Raghunandan Prasad.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant has alleged that his sister was married to the petitioner and the couple was blessed with a son. The further allegation is that earlier the petitioner has administered poison to the said son causing his death. The informant also alleged that the petitioner had even poisoned his first wife causing death and had developed illicit relationship with one of his step daughter-in-law. He further alleged that the accused persons have murdered



his sister and threw her dead body in 'Aahar' and the decomposed body was recovered after three days. Accordingly, the FIR.

4. Earlier the case of the petitioner was heard and rejected on 22.02.2023 in Cr. Misc. No. 12406 of 2023.

5. Again, a fresh application has been preferred whereafter a report was called for on 12.01.2024, which has since been received vide Letter no. 67 dated 15.01.2024 and as per it, the chargesheet witnesses have not appeared though there are eight witnesses including the doctor and the I.O.

6. Though learned counsel for the petitioner tried to impress upon the Court that it was a case of suicide and he has already remained in custody, learned APP submits that a bare perusal of the order would clearly show that till the decomposed body of the lady was recovered three days later, the petitioner who is the husband took no step to even search her.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, for the present, this Court is not inclined to extend him the privilege of bail which is accordingly rejected.

8. However, in view of the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 31.01.2022, it is the duty of the trial court to speed up the matter and conclude the trial within a period of nine



months from today.

9. The S.S.P., Gaya is directed to ensure that all the chargesheet witnesses including the Doctor and the I.O. are presented before the trial court as per the date fixed by it.

10. Let a copy of the order be sent to the Office of S.S.P., Gaya.

11. The Cr. Misc. No. 685 of 2024 stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

kiran/-

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

