

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4531 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-111 Year-2013 Thana- NAYAGAON District- Saran

Ranjit Kumar Singh @ Ranjit Singh @ Ranjit Kumar @ Praveen Singh @
Praveen Kumar @ Satish Kumar @ Gorakh Singh, Son of Nagmani Singh,
R/O Vill- Chaturpur, P.S.-Nayagaon, District-Chhapra(Saran)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Shyam Kishore, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ahmad Ali, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 26-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the 6th attempt of the petitioner to obtain bail in connection with Nayagaon P.S. Case No.111 of 2013 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 364(A)/120(B) and 212 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC). The petitioner has got three criminal antecedents as stated in paragraph '3' of the application. He is in custody since 18.09.2014.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is to kidnap a businessman, alongwith other co-accused persons, who was released after payment of ransom money.

4. This Court having taken note of the seriousness of



the allegations refused to grant regular bail to the petitioner on earlier occasions with some hope that the trial would be concluded within a reasonable period. In its order dated 06.12.2016, the then learned coordinate Bench of this Court rejected the prayer of the petitioner considering the seriousness of the allegations. In the order dated 31.01.2018, it is recorded that up till now 19 prosecution witnesses including the victim, father of the victim and I.O. have already examined and the case is pending for receipt of material exhibits which have been called for by the court on the prayer of the prosecution. The learned coordinate Bench while rejecting the prayer of the petitioner made it clear that if the trial of the petitioner is not concluded within six months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of the order, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail before the trial court itself.

5. Again when the petitioner did not get relief from the trial court, he moved this Court in Cr.Misc.No.68008 of 2018 and this time vide order dated 23.01.2019, this Court rejected the prayer after taking note of the information that now 23 prosecution witnesses out of 59 proposed prosecution witnesses have already been examined. The learned trial court was directed to expedite the trial of the petitioner and to



conclude the same as early as possible.

6. Since then the petitioner has moved thrice and on every occasion, this Court has noticed the number of witnesses examined on behalf of the prosecution. In its order dated 05.08.2021, this Court recorded that out of 59 witnesses, 30 witnesses have been examined, meaning thereby that within a period of two years seven months approximately from the date of earlier rejection only 7 witnesses could be examined.

7. Subsequently, when this matter came before this Court on 12.07.2023 in Cr.Misc.No.40519 of 2022, this Court was informed that 34 witnesses have been examined, therefore, within a period of two years from the date of last rejection only four witnesses were examined. This Court still rejected the prayer and this Court noticed the information of the learned trial court saying that the trial is likely to be concluded within a period of nine months.

8. This application has been filed on 23.01.2025. This Court once again called for a report. The report available on the record is completely vague as it does not give the number of witnesses still required to be examined. The relevant part of the report reads as under:-

“The present stage of trial of S.T. No.404/2015
is of prosecution evidence.



The reason for delay in conclusion of trial is multiple petitions filed by prosecution under various provisions of the Evidence Act to call for various documents and articles seized in connection with the case and kept at different authorities elsewhere such as vehicle in Barachatti P.S. of Gaya District, gold ornaments kept at Chutiya P.S. in Jharkhand, seizure list in different P.S. and trial at Surat and Daman. Other petitions for marking exhibits many documents as bank-statements, seizure list at different places.”

9. Learned APP for the State does not contest the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that as an under-trial prisoner the petitioner has remained in jail for almost 11 years 5 months by now and there is no hope of his release in near future. As regards the criminal antecedents of three cases, he has been acquitted in two cases and in one of the cases he is on bail.

10. In my considered opinion, keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has already spent 11 years 5 months in jail as an under-trial prisoner, his constitutional right of speedy trial is being defeated, this is a fit case in which this Court must direct release of the petitioner on bail. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the



satisfaction of learned Additional District and Sessions Judge-IV, Saran at Chapra in connection with Sessions Trial No.404 of 2015 arising out of Nayagaon P.S. Case No. 111 of 2013, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 480 (3) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita.

11. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

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

