

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69562 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2024 Thana- PIPRAKOTHI District- East Champaran

Samsuddin Hawari S/o Israel Mian R/o Village- Mathurapur Matgopal, P.S.-
Piprakothi, District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Javed Aslam, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Aditya Narayan Singh.1, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dhurendra Kumar, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 28-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Piprakothi P.S. Case No. 132 of 2024, instituted for the offences
under Sections 341, 323, 312, 376, 307, 504 and 493 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 by this Court vide order dated
22.01.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 68425 of 2024 taking into
consideration the statement of the victim recorded under Section
164 of Cr.P.C.

4. In compliance of the order dated 23.09.2025, a
report dated 16.10.2025 with regard to the present stage of trial
has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it



appears that out of seven charge-sheeted witnesses, four witnesses have already been examined. It is further reported that for the evidence of rest of three prosecution witnesses, process has already been issued.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 24.06.2024 without any rhymes or reason and has got no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that all the witnesses have been examined and only one witness is yet to be examined in this case. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege 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 going on and is at an advance stage.

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.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

