

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4592 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-401 Year-2024 Thana- ARA NAWADA District- Bhojpur

Ranjeet Singh @ Ranjeet Kumar Son of Krishna Singh @ Krishana Singh R/o
Village- Bhusaula (Bhushahula), P.S.- Barahara, District- Bhojpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Budhan Paswan Son of Ramdev Ram R/o Village- Bahiro, P.S.- Ara
Nawada, District-Bhojpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Diwakar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Sadanand Paswan, SPP
For the Informant	:	None

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

ORAL ORDER

4 09-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant and learned

Special Public Prosecutor for the State. None appears on behalf

of the informant despite notice being validly served.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant
against the order dated 09.10.2025 passed by learned 1st
Additional Sessions Judge cum Special Judge, SC/ST Act,
Bhojpur at Ara whereby the prayer for bail of the appellant in
connection with Ara Nawada P.S. Case No. 401 of 2024 under
Sections 302, 120B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of
the Arms Act and Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST Act was rejected.

3. Earlier vide order dated 03.03.2025 passed in Cr.
Appeal (SJ) No. 4949 of 2024, regular bail of the appellant was



rejected by this Court considering the material against the appellant in the case diary.

4. In compliance of the order dated 21.11.2025 a report dated 02.12.2022 with regard to the present stage of trial has been received. From perusal of the aforesaid report, it appears that charges have already been framed. It is further reported that there are eight charge-sheeted witnesses and out of which, six witnesses have been examined including the informant.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is languishing in judicial custody since 21.06.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

6. Learned SPP for the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail.

7. There is no fresh ground to consider the bail petition of the appellant. From the aforesaid report, it appears that the trial is going on and is at an advance stage.

8. In view of the above, the prayer for bail of the appellant is again rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of one month, as



stated above, the appellant will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the learned court below.

9. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

