

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6705 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-20 Year-2016 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR RAIL P.S. District-
Saran

=====

Ramesh Vidrohi @ Aditya @ Aaditya @ Dinesh Son of Krishna Prasad
Resident Of Village- Maharajganj Parsouni Police Station- Maharajganj
District -Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Mili Kumari, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Jharkhandi Upadhyay, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the third attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Rail Muzaffarpur P.S. Case No. 20 of 2016 registered for the offences under Section 147, 148, 149, 435, 427, 341, 342, 323, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code; Section 27 of the Arms Act and Section 15, 17, 20 of the U.A.P.A. Act.

3. Earlier the bail applications of the petitioner were rejected twice vide orders dated 19.05.2023 and 31.08.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 25806 of 2023 and 53710 of 2024 respectively.

4. The case of the prosecution is that 30-35 unknown



criminals are said to have assaulted the guard and thereafter, set ablaze the vehicles and snatched the mobile phone from the place of occurrence. Further, the accused persons had left a *purcha* (pamphlet) stating that the action was a retaliation for non payment of *rangdari*.

5. The petitioner is in custody since 18.11.2022 having twelve similar and serious criminal antecedents.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charges have been framed in the trial.

7. Considering the gravity of the offence, the fact that the trial has already started and no fresh ground for grant of bail is made out, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

8. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

9. The Senior Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur is directed to ensure the attendance of the witnesses so that the trial is concluded at the earliest. If the trial is not concluded within one year because of the non- cooperation of the prosecution then the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

10. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the adjudication of the present bail application and shall not prejudice the case of the petitioner at any subsequent stage of the trial and this Court has not express



any opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur forthwith through FAX or e-mail for its compliance.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

