

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88402 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2022 Thana- BIKRAM District- Patna

=====

Sujit Kumar Dubey @ Gobind Kumar Dubey @ Sujit Dubey @ Gobind Kumar S/o Sudhir Kumar Dubey R/o Village - Padariyawa, P.S - Bikram, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 06-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Vikram P.S. Case No. 32 of 2022, registered for the offences punishable under Section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner allegedly shot dead the informant's brother.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 29.01.2022. It is further submitted that the prayer for bail of the present petitioner has already been rejected on two occasions by this Court, vide Cr.



Misc. No. 44762 of 2022 dated 01.02.2023 and Cr. Misc. No. 73917 of 2023, with a direction to expedite the trial. Learned counsel further submits that one case under the Arms Act has been registered subsequently, after institution of the present case. It is also contended that the petitioner has remained in custody for more than four years and one month and that the trial has not yet been concluded, and the delay is not attributable to the petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant vehemently oppose the prayer for bail and submit that there is a specific allegation of firing against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner's earlier bail applications have been rejected on merits and that the post-mortem report supports the allegations made in the F.I.R.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State and the informant submit that they are ready to cooperate for expeditious disposal of the trial.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the arguments advanced on behalf of both sides, and the fact that the petitioner's bail prayer has already been rejected on merits twice, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for bail is hereby rejected.



8. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible. In the event the trial is not concluded preferably within a period of nine months from the date of this order, the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Alok Kumar Pandey, J)

Nilmani/-

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

