

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49369 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-162 Year-2024 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Vishal Kumar S/o Arun Singh @ Arun Prasad Resident OF Mahadeva Road,
PS- Arrah Town, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Saket Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms. Renu Kumari, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 18-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.
No. 166 of 2025, arising out of Ara Town P.S. Case No. 162 of
2024 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 120(B) of the
Indian Penal Code. Earlier vide order dated 24-10-2024, passed
in Cr. Misc. No. 42719 of 2024, regular bail of the petitioner
was rejected by this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is in custody since 06-03-2024, having no criminal
antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner goes on to submit
that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the
near future. It is next submitted charge in this case is framed and



one witness has been examined.

4. On the other hand, learned APP for the State fervently opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP has further relied upon a decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in **2024 SCC Online SC 3539 (X. vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.)**, wherein in paragraph No.14, Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under:

“14. Ordinarily in serious offences like rape, murder, dacoity, etc., once the trial commences and the prosecution starts examining its witnesses, the Court be it the Trial Court or the High Court should be loath in entertaining the bail application of the accused.”

5. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being no fresh ground to reconsider the matter which is already decided by this Court on merit as also taking into account the fact that trial has commenced, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is once again **rejected**.

6. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.



7. However, petitioner will at liberty to renew his prayer for bail, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of production of this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

