

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.3108 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2023 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Kaimur
(Bhabua)

=====

Dhananjay Singh @ Dhananjay Kumar Singh son of Ramadhar Singh
Village- Kinarchola Ps- Bhagwanpur Dist- Kaimur at Bhabua

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Brajesh Ram @ Brajesh Kumar son of Late Basgit Ram Village- Kinarchola
Ps- Bhagwanpur Dist- Kaimur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mrs. Mukul Kumari, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Binay Krishna, SPP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Tribhuvan Narayan, Advocate

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 24-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned

Special Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for

the informant.

2. Earlier, regular bail of the appellant was rejected
vide order dated 09.11.2023 passed in Cr. Appeal (S.J.) No.
3181 of 2023. Present is the second application by way of
appeal for regular bail filed on behalf of the appellant.

3. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant
against the order dated 06.06.2024 passed by Additional District
and Session Judge-I-cum-Special Judge, Kaimur at Bhabua,



whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 93 of 2023 under Sections 302, 342, 504, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 27 of the Arms Act and Sections 3(i)(r)(s) and 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act was rejected.

4. On perusal of the supplementary affidavit submitted by learned counsel for the appellant, it transpires that out of total eight witnesses, only four witnesses including the informant have been examined by the Court below. It also transpires that Charge has already been framed against the appellant.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the appellant, this Court does not find any fresh ground to revisit the matter which is already decided by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on merit. This Court would further take note of the fact that the appellant is in custody since 09.04.2023. Accordingly, taking into account the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and specifically keeping in view the present stage of the case, this Court is not inclined to allow the appeal.

6. Accordingly, the appeal stands dismissed. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial expeditiously. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of four months from



the date of receipt/production, the appellant will have liberty to
renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

