

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38727 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2023 Thana- KHUDWA District- Aurangabad

Anjay Singh Son of Ramashish Singh, Resident of Village- Lahsa, Police Station- Khudwan, Dist- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, Sr. Advocate.
	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate.
	:	Mr. Shivam, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Nityanand, APP.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate.
	:	Mr. Rikesh Sinha, Advocate.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER**

3 29-08-2025 Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Khudwan P.S. Case No.77 of 2023 for the offences registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 504, 506, 324, 307 & 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that this is the second bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner. Earlier, the prayer for bail of petitioner was rejected on merit by this Court vide order dated 22.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No.53718 of 2024. He further submits that the petitioner



is in custody since 21.09.2024 and the charge was framed against the petitioner on 05.12.2024 and there is delay in conclusion of trial. It is further submitted that there is contradiction in the post-mortem report of the victim and the statement of Dr. Shashikant Kumar (PW-1) with respect to injury on the dead body of the victim. He further submitted that the petitioner is entitle to get bail on the ground of delay as the accused person has a right to speedy trial which flows from Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

4. Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the regular bail of petitioner was earlier rejected on merit vide order dated 22.11.2024 and no fresh ground is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner that he caused death to the victim by the blow of *Garasa* and the prosecution has examined a significant number of witnesses, therefore, the petitioner does not deserves the privilege of regular bail.

5. A report was called for regarding the stage of trial vide order dated 11.07.2025 which was received and as per the report dated 18.07.2025 submitted by the Trial Court, out of six



charge-sheeted witnesses, four witnesses have already been examined and steps have been taken to conclude the trial.

6. It is well settled that once the trial commences, it should be allowed to reach its final conclusion which may either result in conviction of the accused or acquittal of the accused. It is not disputed that the accused has a right to speedy trial.

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the allegation against the petitioner that he caused death to the victim by the blow of *Garasa* and also the facts that earlier the bail petition of the petitioner was rejected on merit and in the trial the prosecution has examined a significant number of witnesses, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the bail petition of the petitioner is dismissed.

8. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as soon as possible.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

