

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90348 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-190 Year-2018 Thana- KALUAHI District- Madhubani

Lalbabu Baitha @ Jarlahwa S/o Ram Shankar Baitha R/o vill - Kahtarwa, P.S.
- Sheohar, Distt.- Sheohar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Uday Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman, A.P.P

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

6 25-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Sessions Trial No.110 of 2024 arising out of Kaluahi P.S. Case No.190 of 2018 lodged on 11.12.2018, for the offence punishable under Sections 307 & 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with section 27 of the Arms Act and sections 3/4 of the Explosive Substance Act, pending in the Court of Additional Sessions Judge 3rd, Madhubani.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the regular bail application of the petitioner has earlier been rejected *vide* order dated 20.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9325 of



2024 with liberty granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail three months after framing of charge as well as with the documents provided by the petitioner that he is not absconding in any of the criminal cases pending against him. Counsel submits that the charge has been framed in this case on 02.09.2024 (annexed at page no.23 of the present bail application) and more than three months have already been lapsed. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 31.08.2023.

4. Learned APP for the State on the other hand opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is not clean as there are six cases pending against him. Counsel further submits that it is true that the liberty was granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail three months after framing of charge. In addition to that, the petitioner was also directed to produce documents to establish that he is not absconding in any of the criminal cases pending against him, and the FIR numbers of those cases have also been mentioned in the present FIR.

5. In response thereof, counsel for the petitioner submits that the *pairvikar* of the petitioner is not in a position to provide the documents to establish whether or not the petitioner



is absconding in the pending cases.

6. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

