

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15124 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2020 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

PUNJIT YADAV Son of Umesh Yadav, Resident of Village - Mathahi, Ward
No.05, P.S.- Madhepura, Distt.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nityanand, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER**

2 19-07-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State through virtual court proceedings.

Learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the office within four weeks of normal functioning of the court, failing which the office is directed to place the matter before the Bench.

The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 384, 307, 506 of the Indian Penal Code and 27 of the Arms Act.

Prosecution case, in brief is that on 10.01.2020, the informant was going to Madhepura and he reached in front of the house of one Sanjay Yadav, all of a sudden, a notorious criminal (petitioner) came and stopped the informant and threatened him to withdraw the case lodged against him and



demanded Rs.2,00,000/- at present and Rs.10,000/- per month as Rangdari, otherwise he will be killed. Further prosecution case is that the petitioner fired upon the informant from his firearms thrice with intent to kill him, but fortunately did not hit him. On hearing the sound of firing, the nearby people assembled there and then, the petitioner fled away.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that there is allegation against the petitioner is that who fired upon the deceased but no any firearm injury was found. The petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 29.09.2020. The petitioner has got 10 criminal antecedents which is mentioned in para 3 of the bail petition.

Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner had fired upon the informant with intention to kill him.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected in connection with Madhepura P.S. Case No. 22/2020 from the Court of learned C.J.M., Madhepura.

Accordingly, this application is dismissed.



However, the petitioner is at liberty to renew his
prayer for bail after framing of the charge.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

amitkumar/-

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

