

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-611 Year-2022 Thana- MADHAURAH District- Saran

=====

Vivek Kumar @ Chunu Baba @ Chunnu Baba @ Bibek Kumar S/O Raj
Kishor Singh Resident of Village - Marhaura Khurd Maraurha Khurd Vaishya
tola, P.S.-Marhaura Maraurha, District-Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gaurav Kumar, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 12-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. This is the third attempt on behalf of the petitioner
for grant of bail in connection with Madhaurah P.S. Case
No.611 of 2022 registered for the offence under sections 467,
468, 471, 413, 414, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and
under sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail applications of the petitioner were
rejected twice vide orders dated 30.01.2024 and 06.03.2025



passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 11759 of 2023 and 8021 of 2025 respectively. The following order was passed on 06.03.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 8021 of 2025, which reads as under:

“Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Madhaurah P.S. Case No.611 of 2022 registered for the offence under sections 467, 468, 471, 413, 414, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and under sections 25(1-b)a, 26 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail has been rejected vide order dated 30.01.2024 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No.11759 of 2023.

4. There is recovery of two country made pistols, three live cartridges and mobile from the possession of the petitioner. 5. The petitioner is in custody since 18.09.2022. He is accused in seventeen more criminal cases.

6. Considering the offence committed by the petitioner and the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, this bail application is rejected.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charges have been framed in the trial.

5. Considering the antecedents of the petitioner and also the fact that the trial has started, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

8. The Superintendent of Police, Saran is directed to



ensure the appearance of the witnesses in the trial so that the trial is not delayed.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Superintendent of Police, Saran forthwith through FAX or e-mail for its compliance.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

