

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53241 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-451 Year-2024 Thana- ALAMGANJ District- Patna

Ranjan Yadav S/O Late Suresh Kumar Yadav @ Suresh Yadav Gupta R/O
Village- Mangal Talab, Kachauri Gali, Pani Tanki, P.S- Chowk, Distt.- Patna.
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Pravashankar Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP
For the Informant :	Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Alamganj P.S. Case No. 451 of 2024, instituted for the offences
punishable under Sections 307 & 302 of the Indian Penal Code
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

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 23-01-2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 77824 of 2024, taking
into account the nature of offence, which is serious and heinous.

4. In compliance of the order dated 01-08-2025, a
report with regard to the present stage of trial has been received.
From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that nine witness



are yet to be examined. It is further reported that trial is expected to be concluded within a period of three months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 08-06-2024 without any rhymes or reason. Learned counsel submits that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future, hence, petitioner deserves the privilege of bail.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is expected to conclude within a period of three months.

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 two months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of two months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

