

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86578 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-359 Year-2022 Thana- MOUZA HIDPUR District- Bhagalpur

Ajit Kumar Yadav @ Ajit kumar @ Karku Yadav Son of Laxmikant Yadav
Resident of Village- Kutub Ganj, Post- GPO, P.S.- Mojahidpur (Babarganj),
Distt.- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Sr. Advocate. Mr. Ravi Prakash Dwivedi, Advocate. Mr. Saurabh Raj, Advocate. Mr. Roushan Kumar, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

11 09-01-2026 1. Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Mojahidpur (Babarganj) P.S. Case No.359 of 2022 for the
offences registered under Sections 341, 307, 302, 120B, 34 of the
I.P.C. and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits
that this is the second bail petition filed on behalf of the
petitioner. Earlier, the bail application of petitioner was
dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated
26.04.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No.77729 of 2023. He further
submits that petitioner is in custody since 21.09.2023 and out of
seven prosecution witnesses, only four prosecution witnesses have
been examined till date. Learned Senior Counsel submits that
there is no likelihood of the trial to be concluded in near future.



He further submits that the petitioner will not abscond and he shall co-operate in the trial.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the charge in this case has been framed on 20.09.2024 and the trial is likely to be concluded in near future. He further submits that petitioner is the main assailant on whom there is an allegation that he fired on the chest of the deceased and he also has two criminal antecedents, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.

5. Having heard learned counsels for the parties and considering that no fresh ground is made out by the petitioner for consideration of bail and also considering that most of the prosecution witnesses have been examined, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

6. The learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and dispose of the case at earliest in view of the custody period of the petitioner.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

