

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60360 of 2025
In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81713 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-435 Year-2023 Thana- MANER District- Patna

=====

Dhananjay Kumar S/o Ram Babu Ray Resident of Hira Tola, Sherpur, P.S.-
Maner, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jai Shankar Pathak, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ahmad Ali, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 26-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Maner
P.S. Case No. 435 of 2023, instituted for the offences under
Sections 302, 120(B), 34 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 by this Court vide order dated
10.01.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 81713 of 2025, taking into
account the nature of allegation against the petitioner.

4. In compliance of the order dated 27.08.2025, a
report dated 09.09.2025 with regard to the present stage of trial
has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it



appears that charge has not yet been framed against the petitioner. It is further reported that the case is still pending for appearance of two accused persons.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 05.09.2023 without any rhymes or reason and has got eight 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 in progress and considering the specific allegation against the petitioner, which is serious in nature, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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. However, if the trial is not concluded within the period of six months, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

