

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59847 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-204 Year-2024 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

Nikhil Kumar @ Ranjeet Kumar S/o Balindra Rai Resident of Sultanpur,
Pipapul Ghat, PS- Danapur, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoranjan Kumar
For the State : Mr. Abhay Kumar
For the Informant : Mr. Tej Pratap Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 10-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the
informant and learned APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for
grant of bail in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 204 of 2024
registered for the offence under Sections 147, 149, 323, 325, 307,
504, 506 of the IPC and added Section 302 of the IPC.

3. Earlier, the bail application of the petitioner has been
rejected by this Court vide order dated 18.01.2025 passed in Cr.
Misc. No. 65875 of 2024, which reads as follows:

*“Heard learned counsel for the petitioner,
learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for
the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection
with Danapur P.S. Case No. 204 of 2024 registered for
the offence under Sections 147, 149, 323, 325, 307,
504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and
subsequently Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code was
also added.*



3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner and others are said to have assaulted the deceased. The deceased has sustained 12 injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that they are ready to cooperate in the trial as they have stated earlier in the case of Lal Babu Rai but since the case has not been committed, they are helpless.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner has participated in the assault of the deceased which caused the death of the deceased, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is dismissed.

7. The District Judge, Patna is directed to see to it that the case is committed at the earliest and charges are framed so that on the ground of delay of trial, assailant of the deceased are not granted bail.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the District Judge, Patna through FAX for its compliance forthwith.”

4. From perusal of the order dated 11.12.2024 which is impugned in Cr. Misc. Nos. 47838 of 2025 and 49906 of 2025, it appears that learned counsel for the informant has assured the Court that the prosecution will not delay the trial and will produce the witnesses on the dates fixed. Today, it is not in dispute that not even a single witness has been examined in the trial by the prosecution and today again, the learned counsel for the informant submits that he will examine the witnesses within a stipulated period.



5. The informant cannot be allowed to act in such a callous manner and oppose the prayer for bail without producing the witnesses in the Court during the trial despite having given an assurance to this Court that the witnesses shall be produced on the dates fixed.

6. The petitioner is in custody since 29.06.2024.

7. Considering the period of custody, the delay in trial and the misconduct of the informant, this application is allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.C.J.M.-I, Danapur in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 204 of 2024.

9. As a condition of this order, the petitioner after being released on bail, is directed to co-operate in the trial either by appearing personally or through his lawyer in the trial Court on each and every date fixed by the trial Court. Non-compliance of the condition will result in cancellation of the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

priyanka/-

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

