

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30764 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2025 Thana- BODHGAYA District- Gaya

Binod Yadav S/O Late Ramdhani Yadav Village- Nawadih, P.S.- Dobhi, Dist.-
Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agarwal, Sr. Advocate Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate Mr. Uday Pratap Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Rajendra Nath Jha, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 21-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State as also learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with S.T.
No. 693 of 2025 arising out of Bodh Gaya P.S. Case No. 104 of
2025 instituted for the offence under Sections 140(1) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Subsequently, Sections 103(1),
238, 61(2) of the BNS and Section 27 of the Arms Act were
added.

3. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for bail.
The petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of regular bail
which was earlier rejected on merit by a Co-ordinate Bench (as
His Lordship then was) of this Court vide order dated



07.01.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 47516 of 2025, taking into account the fact that trial is on the verge of its conclusion.

4. As per prosecution case, the deceased was done to death by her family members. Her marriage was solemnized with Vikash Kumar, son of the petitioner.

5. In compliance of the order dated 07.05.2026 a report dated 09.06.2026 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that all charge sheet witnesses have been examined in this case. It is further reported that case is fixed for documentary evidence.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 11.04.2025 without any rhymes or reason, having three (3) criminal antecedents. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no likelihood of the trial being concluded in the near future, hence, petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

7. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant opposes the prayer for grant of bail by contending that trial is on the verge of its conclusion and hence, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

8. There is no new ground to consider the bail petition



of the petitioner. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on and is on the verge of its conclusion.

9. 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.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

