IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63955 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010911802026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2023 Thana- KHIJARSARAI District- Gaya

==========

Ravi Kumar, S/O Mahendra Sao, R/O Village- Chiraili, P.S.- Khizersarai, Distt.- Gaya.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manish Kumar No.2, Advocate
Mr.Aryan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Ballabh Singh, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

3 29-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 638 of 2023, arising out of Khizersarai P.S. Case No. 79 of 2023 for the alleged offences under Sections 304(B), 201 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegation against the petitioner-husband is that he killed his wife on account of non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and concealed her dead body.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is third attempt of the petitioner to seek bail from this Court. Earlier, the prayers for bail of the petitioner were rejected vide

WEB COPY

orders dated 08.10.2024 & 26.02.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 3673 of 2024 & 13625 of 2026, respectively. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 09.05.2023 and trial is still continuing. When the prayer for bail of the petitioner was last considered by the learned Coordinate Bench on 26.02.2026, due to some confusion, it has been submitted that trial was at the verge of its conclusion as all the charge-sheet named witnesses have been examined. But till date only nine witnesses have been examined out of 12 charge-sheet named witnesses. The learned counsel further submits that there is no likelihood of early conclusion of trial and the case of the petitioner may be considered sympathetically for grant of bail as minimum punishment for the offence under Section 304(B) IPC is 7 years.

5. The learned APP vehemently opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. The learned APP submits that no fresh ground has been brought on record for reconsideration of prayer of bail and the period of custody could not be a ground.

6. A report was called from the learned trial court about the present stage of trial and the said report has been received wherein it has been mentioned that out of 12 charge-

WEB COPY

sheet named witnesses, nine have been examined.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances and submission made on behalf of the parties, I do not find any new ground to reconsider the prayer for bail of the petitioner at this stage.

8. Hence, his prayer for grant of bail is rejected.

9. However, the learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and take steps for its conclusion at the earliest considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 09.05.2023 and charges were framed on 21.06.2024 as submitted by the learned trial court.

10. It is expected that the learned trial court would take up the matter on day to day basis and make endeavour to dispose it of expeditiously preferably within three months.

11. At the same time, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya Ji is directed to ensure the presence of the remaining prosecution witnesses on the dates fixed before the learned trial court. In case, the Senior Superintendent of Police fails to produce the witnesses on the dates fixed, he will be called before this Court to explain his conduct.

12. Office is directed to communicate this order to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya Ji immediately for

WEB COPY

compliance.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

U		T	

WEB COPY