

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5720 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2023 Thana- LUTUA District- Gaya

Surendra Yadav @ Surendra Kumar @ Kuhur son of Kishori Yadav Village -
Asurain, Ps- Lutua Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

8 25-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Lutua
P.S. Case No. 22 of 2023, dated 26.12.2023 instituted for the
offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 364(A), 385, 387,
504, 506, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25(1-b)a
of the Arms Act and Sections 10, 11 and 13 of U.A.P. Act.

3. Prayer of the petitioner for bail was earlier rejected
on merit by this Court *vide* order dated 26.07.2024 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 40361 of 2024.

4. This is the second attempt for grant of bail by the
petitioner. Save and except period of custody, nothing has
changed and no fresh ground is submitted by the learned
counsel for the petitioner for enlarging the petitioner on bail.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that except statement of victim recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., no cogent material has come against the petitioner during the course of investigation. It is further submitted that petitioner is also victim of the alleged occurrence.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner has been named by the victim in his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., I am not inclined to reconsider the prayer for bail.

6. However, the learned trial Court is directed to take all endeavour and conclude the trial positively within a period of nine (09) months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order. If the trial is not concluded within nine months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

7. With the aforesaid observation, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is once again rejected.

(Khatim Reza, J)

Sankalp/-

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

