

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41728 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-109 Year-2024 Thana- BAGENGOLA District- Buxar

1. Rajendra Singh @ Rajendra Yadav, S/O Ram Chandar Singh, R/O Village- Barhadi Tola, Chhapra, P.S- Bagengola, Distt.- Buxar (Bihar).
2. Ram Chandar Singh, S/O Late Sadhu Yadav, R/O Village- Barhadi Tola, Chhapra, P.S- Bagengola, Distt.- Buxar (Bihar).
3. Pappu Kumar @ Pappu Kumar Singh, S/O Rajendra Singh @ Rajendra Yadav, R/O Village- Barhadi Tola, Chhapra, P.S- Bagengola, Distt.- Buxar (Bihar).
4. Rajesh Kumar @ Rajesh Kumar Singh, S/O Rajendra Singh @ Rajendra Yadav, R/O Village- Barhadi Tola, Chhapra, P.S- Bagengola, Distt.- Buxar (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Lal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 06-08-2025 Heard Mr. Abhay Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for

the petitioners and Mr. Bharat Lal, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners have prayed for bail in connection
with Bagengola P.S. Case No. 109 of 2024 registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 191(1), 191(2), 190, 329(3),
115(2), 118, 117(2) and 103(1) of B.N.S.

3. The case of the prosecution in short is that all the
petitioners assaulted the father-in-law of the informant Baijnath
Singh (deceased) due to which he succumbed to the injuries.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has submitted that petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. They have been falsely implicated in this case. There is specific allegation against each of the petitioners but from perusal of the postmortem report, it will transpire that there were only three antemortem injuries on the person of the deceased and all the injuries were caused by hard and blunt substance. A statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioners have no criminal antecedent. Petitioner no. 1 is languishing in judicial custody since 26.12.2024 and petitioner nos. 2 to 4 are languishing in judicial custody since 31.10.2024.

5. The application for bail is vehemently opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that in this case, the stage of the trial was called for from the learned trial Court. From perusal of the report of the trial Court, it is clear that altogether three witnesses have been examined.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that since the trial is at advance stage, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail at this stage and, as such, their prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. The learned trial Court is directed to expedite the



trial.

8. Petitioners are at liberty to renew their prayer for
bail, if the trial is not concluded within six months.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

lata/-

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

