

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5099 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-165 Year-2024 Thana- DAGARUA District- Purnia

=====

Azizul Rahman @ Md. Azizul Son of Gulam Mustafa @ Md. Mustafa
Resident of Village - Dumra Dhahgama, P.S.- Dagarua, District – Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.N.K. Agarwal, Advocate
		Mr.Md Fazle Karim, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Sunil Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 18-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.Tr. No.
329 of 2025, arising out of Dagarua P.S. Case No. 165 of 2024
instituted for the offences under Sections 302 and 304(B)/34 of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. Earlier vide order dated 13.05.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 12649 of 2025, regular bail of the petitioner was
rejected by this Court considering the nature and gravity of the
offence, with direction to the Court below to expedite the trial
and conclude the same expeditiously.

4. In compliance of the order dated 29.01.2026, a report
dated 23.02.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has



been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that out of seven Chargesheet witnesses, four witnesses have been examined. It is further reported that the trial of this case would be concluded within four months.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 30.05.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no fresh ground to consider the bail petition of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on.

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 and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of three months, as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

