

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.18821 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -96 Year- 2011 Thana -MUNGER MUFFASIL District- MUNGER

1. Ram Gulam Yadav Son of Jaldhar Yadav, Resident of Village - Taufir
Mai, P.S. - Muffasil, District - Munger. Petitioner/s
Versus

1. The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate

Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar 1 (App)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA
ORAL ORDER

4 30-06-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. representing the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Muffasil
P.S. Case No. 96 of 2011 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 147, 148, 149, 342, 323, 302, 387 and 385 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

Allegedly, other co-accused opened fire causing death,
the allegation for opening fire is also against accused Pampam
Singh and against the petitioner there is allegation that he along
with Jaldhar Singh, Nirodh Yadav, Naim Khan, Mastan Singh and
Pampam Singh took away forcibly one Randhir Yadav whose
dead body was subsequently found.

Submission is of false implication and that in this case
similarly situated Naim Khan and Pampam Singh have been
allowed bail vide Cri. Misc. Nos. 21488 of 2016 and 2154 of 2015

respectively, by another co-ordinate Bench of this Court and the petitioner suffering in custody since 21.12.2015, deserves sympathetic consideration.

The learned A.P.P. submits that the petitioner has got criminal antecedent and he along with others have taken away Randhir Yadav and further prayer of bail of other co-accused has also been rejected.

In the facts and circumstances stated above, the petitioner above named is directed to be released on bail on execution of bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned S.D.J.M., Munger in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 96 of 2011 subject to the conditions that one of the bailors must be near relative and another having sufficient immovable property within the territorial jurisdiction of the court concerned and the petitioner shall remain present on each and every date during trial and the default on two consecutive dates on his part without any reason shall disentitle the petitioner from privilege of bail.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

sushma/-

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