

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12415 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2023 Thana- MANIHARI District- Katihar

=====

Shekh Sonu @ Md. Sonu @ Sk. Sonu @ Sonu Son of Shekh Mehndi R/Vill-
Bauliya Gumti, P.S.- Manihari, Distt- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Jha, Adv.

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 09-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T.
No. 671 of 2023 arising out of Manihari P.S. Case No. 142 of
2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections
302/34 of the IPC.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner and others are
said to have concertedly assaulted and abused the informant and
his family member. It is further alleged that petitioner stabbed
informant's father upon the chest as a result of which he
sustained injury and died during the course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that bail
of the present petitioner has already been rejected on merit vide
order dated 19.04.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 16887 of 2024.



He further submits that occurrence took place on 20.06.2023 and FIR has been lodged on 21.06.2023 which casts doubt upon the authenticity of the prosecution story. He further submits that petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2023 and up till now trial has not been concluded and delay of trial is not attributable to the petitioner. Hence, petitioner deserves bail.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that bail prayer of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit. He further submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner to stab the informant's father and same is supported by the postmortem report as mentioned in the impugned order. He further submits that ten prosecution witnesses have already been examined and only one witness is yet to be examined which shows that trial is at the fag end and at this stage, petitioner 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. 209/ 2025 dated 16.04.2025 has sent its report which reveals that out of eleven charge-sheeted witnesses, ten witnesses have already been examined and only one witness is yet to be examined. The aforesaid report further reveals that trial court has sought 90 days time to conclude the trial.



7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly keeping in view that earlier bail prayer of the petitioner has been rejected on merit as well as report of trial court, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

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

