

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46224 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-559 Year-2017 Thana- NAGAR District- Vaishali

=====

Tinku Kumar S/o Late Chulhai Ray Resident of Village- Litiyahi, Police
Station- Raghapur, Distt- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Sweety Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 02-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Hajipur Town P.S. Case No. 559 of 2017, instituted for the

offences under Sections 366(A), 365 and 34 of the Indian Penal

Code.

3. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for bail.

The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of regular bail

which was earlier rejected on merit by this Court vide order

dated 20.09.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 13281 of 2024.

4. In compliance of the order dated 07.07.2025 a

report dated 28.07.2025 with regard to the present stage of trial

has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it

appears that Charge has been framed against the petitioner under

Sections 365, 376 and 366(A) of the Indian Penal Code and



bailable warrant have been issued against all the Charge-sheeted witnesses for their evidence but witnesses are yet to be examined. It is further reported that the trial is likely to be concluded within nine months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 02.09.2023 without any rhymes or reason and has got no criminal antecedents.

6. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is again rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of five months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of five months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

