

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51822 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-486 Year-2016 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

1. Inderdeo Chaudhary S/o Baijnath Chaudhary Resident of Village- Tarma Meyari, P.S.- Fatehpur, District- Gaya,
2. Lalu Kumar @ Lalu Chaudhary S/o Bindeshwari Chaudhary @ Bindeshwari Chaudhary R/o vill - Mardi, P.S.- Wazirganj, Distt.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manish Kumar-II, Advocate
	:	Mr. Gajendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pronoti Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

5 12-12-2025 Heard Mr. Manish Kumar-II, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP representing the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 486 of 2016 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 27 of the Arms Act, lodged on 02.11.2016 by the informant Soni Devi.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant, a lady, alleged that earlier, son of Laljit Chaudhary was assassinated in which her husband was an accused. Once, he was out of jail, the accused persons used to threaten him of dire consequences and



in furtherance of that, they fired indiscriminately which ultimately led to his death.

4. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner was rejected in Cr. Misc. No. 80237 of 2024 on 21.11.2024 and this is the second petition.

5. The Trial Court was directed to submit a report, according to which, the charge-sheet has been submitted, cognizance taken and charge framed on 21.02.2025 but the witnesses have been produced causing the delay.

6. The informant has alleged opening of fire against these two petitioners which hit her husband and ultimately led to the death. They chose to abscond for a long time which delayed the trial, charges have been framed, in that background, this Court is not inclined to to extend them privilege of bail which is accordingly rejected.

7. However, this Court cannot overlook the fact that they are in custody since 03.09.2024. The charge has already been framed and as such, taking into account the fact that the case is of the year 2016, the same has to be expedited. The Trial Court should take all the steps to ensure that the prosecution witnesses are produced/examined and the trial is taken to its logical conclusion.



8. Let a copy of the order be sent to the office of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gayaji for his/her perusal and needful. He/she shall ensure that the witnesses named in the present case are presented before the Trial Court by the Police without any unnecessary delay.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

