

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1813 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-15 Year-2023 Thana- KORMA District- Sheikhpura

1. Sakal Deo Yadav S/o- Late Ramswarup Yadav Village- Puraina P.S. Korma Dist- Sheikhpura
2. Ranjan Yadav @ Aniket Kumar S/o- Sri Pasupati Yadav Village- Puraina P.S. Korma Dist- Sheikhpura
3. Ravish Kumar S/o- Late Ram Pravesh Yadav Village- Puraina P.S. Korma Dist- Sheikhpura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Sr. Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. S.R. Haque, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 28-02-2025 Heard Mr. Rajendra Prasad, learned senior Advocate for the petitioners and Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, learned APP for the State. The informant is represented through Mr. S.R. Haque, learned Advocate.

2. The petitioners seek regular bail, who are in custody in connection with S.T. No. 37 of 2024 arising out of Korma P.S. Case No. 15 of 2023 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 342, 323, 324, 325, 307, 302, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the



petitioners as earlier, the prayer of the petitioners came to be turned down by this Court vide order dated 20.09.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 9992 of 2024 taking note of the specific nature of accusation and the fact that the trial is at the fag end.

4. The prosecution case is based on the fardbeyan of the informant, alleging therein that the petitioners along with other co-accused persons have fired upon the informant and his brother due to which both got injured.

5. Learned senior Advocate for the petitioners has drawn the attention of this Court to the earlier order of rejection dated 20.09.2024 and submitted that despite the observation and expectation made by this Court “that the trial court shall take all endeavours to conclude the trial expeditiously”, till date even after lapse of more than five months, the trial has not been concluded. Though, liberty was granted to the petitioners to move before this Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of two months.

6. On the other hand, learned APP for the State as well as learned Advocate for the informant submit at the Bar that the case is fixed for argument on the defence side but on the last date, on account of casual leave of the Presiding Officer, the same could not be concluded. It is further contended that the



prayer for bail of the petitioners have already been turned down on merit and there is no cogent and overwhelming circumstances warranting interference. Moreover, apart from the fact that the case is running on argument, there is specific allegation against all the petitioners of making indiscriminate firing.

7. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and considering the fact that the case is fixed for argument, this Court is not acceded to the prayer of the petitioners and as such the same stands rejected. However, it is expected that the learned trial court shall conclude the argument on day to day basis and bring the trial to its logical conclusion as early as possible.

(Harish Kumar, J)

priyanka/-

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

