

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1225 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-23 Year-2018 Thana- GHOSWARI District- Patna

Ranjeet Yadav @ Vikki Yadav @ B.P. Yadav Son of Late Bashishta Yadav
Resident of Village- Gosaigaon, PS- Ghoswari, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rakesh Bihari Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr.Md. Mushtaque Alam, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar @ S.K., Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

6 09-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.Tr.
No. 792 of 2023 arising out of Ghoswari P.S. Case No. 23 of
2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147,
148, 149, 302, 386 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, petitioner and others are
said to have concertedly made indiscriminate firing upon
informant's husband and son as a result of which they sustained
injury on head and stomach and both of them died on the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that bail
of the present petitioner has already been rejected on merit vide
order dated 18.01.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 85731 of 2023.



He further submits that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner bears criminal antecedent of seven cases, out of which in five cases petitioner is on bail. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2023 and only charge has been framed on 01.09.2023 and since then no progress has been made in the trial. He further submits that delay of trial is not in any way attributable to the petitioner. Hence, petitioner deserves bail.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that bail prayer of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit. It has further been submitted that it is a case of double murder and petitioner alongwith others are said to have made indiscriminate firing from their rifle and both informant's husband and son died on the spot on account of the said injury. Hence, petitioner does not deserve bail.

6. A report regarding stage of trial has been sought by this court and in pursuance of the said direction, the trial court vide letter no. 52 dated 19.04.2025 has sent its report which reveals that charge has been framed on 01.09.2023 and out of seven charge-sheeted witnesses, one witness has already been



examined and for examination of rest witnesses, summons and N.B.W. have already been issued. The aforesaid report further reveals that trial court has sought six months time to conclude the trial.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly keeping in view that earlier bail prayer of the petitioner has been rejected on merit as well as report of trial court, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

shahzad/-

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

