

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.280 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-6 Year-2022 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

=====

Anuj Kumar @ Ramanuj Prasad Yadav @ Anuj Yadav Son of Late Rupan
Yadav Resident of Thekhi, P.S. - Fatehpur, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Patanjali Rishi, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Renu Kumari, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

4 27-03-2025 Heard Mr. Patanjali Rishi, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Ms. Renu Kumari, learned APP for the State.

Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S. Tr.

No. 592 of 2022 arising out of Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 06 of

2022 instituted for the offence under Sections 307, 302 & 34 of

the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The present one is the fourth attempt of the

petitioner for grant of regular bail. Earlier vide orders dated 18-

01-2023, 25-08-2023 & 26-04-2024, passed in Cr. Misc Nos.

40981 of 2022, Cr. Misc. No. 46672 of 2023 & Cr. Misc. No.

23962 of 2024, regular bail of the petitioner was thrice rejected.

4. In pursuance to the direction of this Court, a report



dated 22-02-2025, with regard to present stage of trial has been received, wherein, it is reported that the charge was framed on 05.10.2023, and ten out of twelve prosecution witnesses, including part-cross of the informant, have been examined. The remaining cross-examination of witness and evidence are pending. The trial is delayed as the court has been vacant since 01.02.2025, and the case was transferred to Ld. D.A.S.J.-XIII on 21.02.2025.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court does not find any fresh ground to revisit the matter which is already decided on merit. The Court would further take note of the fact that petitioner is languishing in custody since 23-03-2022.

6. Accordingly, considering the report of the trial which suggests that trial is on the verge of its conclusion, this Court is not inclined to take a different view of the matter. Prayer for grant of bail is once again *rejected*.

7. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

8. The District Magistrate, Gaya and the Superintendent of Police, Gaya are also directed to take



necessary steps to produce the witnesses on the date fixed in the Trial Court so that the trial could be concluded within the stipulated period.

9. Let this order be communicated to the District Magistrate, Gaya and the Superintendent of Police, Gaya.

10. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within a period of two months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

