

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18643 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-764 Year-2021 Thana- FORBESGANJ District- Araria

Sharvan Kumar Singh @ Sharvan Kr. Singh @ Sharvan Singh, Son of Nand Lal Singh, Resident of Village -Khabaspur, PS- Simraha, District -Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 27-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail, who is in custody in connection with Forbisganj (Simraha) P.S. Case No. 764 of 2021 registered for the offence punishable under Section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail, as earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner stood negated by this Court vide order dated 20.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No.28233 of 2024, taking note of the materials available on record, including the postmortem report, which suggests various external injuries over the body of the deceased, coupled with the statement of witnesses.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner fairly



contended that since the prayer for bail of the petitioner was turned down on merit(s), he is not pressing the same on merit(s); however, this fact cannot be ignored that the petitioner has been incarcerated since 20.09.2021 and more than three years and nine months have been elapsed.

5. Referring to the earlier order passed by this Court on 20.07.2024, learned Advocate for the petitioner further contended that on the last occasion, this Court taking note of the prolonged incarceration of the petitioner, has observed that the Trial Court shall take all efforts to conclude the trial within six months. Liberty was also granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail, if trial is not concluded within the stipulated period. It is the admitted position that till date, trial is not concluded.

6. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State opposed the bail application and submitted that serious allegation has been levelled against the petitioner and the report furnished by the I/C, District & Additional Sessions Judge-2, Araria, clearly suggests that there is every likelihood of conclusion of the trial within three months.

7. Considering the specific allegation against the petitioner and the report of the Trial Court, this Court is not



persuaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail for the present.
Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

8. In case, the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

