

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.1707 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2012 Thana- BARHARA KOTHI District- Purnia

Bhushan Yadav Son of Late Baleshwar Yadav @ Late Balo Yadav Resident of  
village - Shishwa, P.S.- Barhara (Raghubansh Nagar O.P.), District - Purnea

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Prakash Tuddu @ Pakka Tuddu Son of Jagai Tuddu Resident of village -  
Bhatsara, Santhali Tola, P.S.- Barhara, District - Purnea

... .. Respondent/s

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                     |
|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant/s  | : | Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Adv<br>Mr.Pawan Kumar, Adv |
| For the Respondent/s | : | Mr.Binay Krishna, APP                               |
| For the O.P. No. 2   | : | Mr. Yogendra Kumar, Adv                             |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND  
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

7      19-12-2025                      Heard Mr. Ramakant Sharma, learned Sr. Advocate  
for the appellant and learned APP for the State.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 30.04.2022 passed by learned 1<sup>st</sup> Additional Sessions Judge cum Special Judge SC/ST Act, Purnea whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Barahara P.S. Case No. 215 of 2012 under Section 147, 148, 149, 302, 120B and 504 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act and Section 3(x)(i)(xi) of the SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. Learned Sr. Counsel appears on behalf of the



appellant submits that this is a second bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 29.02.2024 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 3161 of 2022.

4. On perusal of materials available on record, it appears that this case is pending for prosecution witness. On earlier occasion, Status report vide letter no. 142 of 2025 has been sent by the District and Additional Session Judge-I mentioning that the Trial shall be concluded within nine to ten month. In these circumstances, the concerned Court is directed to adhere to his said letter and conclude the Trial within ten months failing which the petitioner may renew the prayer for bail.

5. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellant is hereby rejected.

**(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)**

Sunnykr/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

