

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39657 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-81 Year-2024 Thana- ROH District- Nawada

Sarita Devi W/O - Late Sunil Rajak R/o Village- Barapandeya, P.S.- Roh,
District- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 12-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.
No. 472 of 2024 arising out of Roh P.S. Case No. 81 of 2024
instituted for the offences under Sections 302, 201/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, on the alleged date and
time, the husband of the informant left house but did not return.
It is further alleged that next day, the dead body of the
informant's husband was found in a sack near Anaila Sundar
Road and was cut into pieces.

4. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of
regular bail which was earlier rejected by this Court vide order



dated 26.10.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 43268 of 2024.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 26.03.2024 and has no criminal antecedent. He further submits that till 12.02.2025, four witnesses have been examined who have not supported the prosecution case and, thereafter, no witness has been examined till date and, thus, there is no likelihood of conclusion of the trial in near future.

6. In compliance to the order of this Court dated 27.06.2025, the learned court below has sent a report regarding present stage of trial.

7. The report of the learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-IX, Nawada dated 30th June, 2025 suggests that till date five witnesses have been examined and four witnesses are yet to be produced by the prosecution for evidence and, at present, the case record is running for the prosecution evidence.

8. There is no new ground to consider the bail application of the petitioner.

9. In that view of the matter, the present application is again rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of four months from today.



10. If the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period of four months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail before the learned court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

