

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3981 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-1987 Thana- ATHMALGOLA District- Patna

=====

Dhannu Paswan, aged about 65 years, Male, Son of Late Ram Lakhan Paswan, resident of Village- Barah Old, P.S.- Harnaut (Kalyan Bigha), District- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Kumari Pallavi, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Athmalgola PS Case No.28 of 1987 dated 26.01.1987, instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 396, 412 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on the alleged date of occurrence when the informant was sleeping in his room, 7-8 criminals having pistols and rifles in their hands entered in his room and committed *dacoity*. Thereafter, the miscreants also committed *dacoity* in the house of the brother of the informant. It is further alleged that they were 20-25 in numbers. When the villagers chased the miscreants, they threw



bomb on the villagers due to which one villager sustained bomb injury and died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. The petitioner had no knowledge about the present case and he use to reside out of the State to earn his livelihood. During the investigation or after investigation, the petitioner did not surrender because he was not aware about the same and only on 20.06.2025, the petitioner was arrested and sent to judicial custody. The trial against other two accused persons, namely, Kauleshwar Paswan and Mannu Paswan, has concluded in Sessions Trial No.226 of 1988 and they have been acquitted on 25.11.2010 by the 3rd Additional Sessions Judge, Patna.

5. Learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail. Learned APP submits that it is a case of the year 1987 and the petitioner evaded the process of law for about four decades and he does not deserve bail especially on account of his conduct.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Accordingly, prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail is rejected at this stage.



8. The learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible, preferably, within a period of three months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order even by fixing the case on day to day basis if necessary.

9. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within the stipulated period.

10. The application stands dismissed with the aforesaid direction/observation.

(Khatim Reza, J)

J. Alam/-

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

