

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA  
(FROM RESIDENTIAL OFFICE VIA VIDEO APPLICATION)  
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5546 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-94 Year-2020 Thana- NATHNAGAR District- Bhagalpur

SINTU YADAV SON OF AMLI YADAV RESIDENT OF VILLAGE -  
KARAILA, BAIRIA, P.S. - MADHUSUDANPUR (NATH NAGAR),  
DISTRICT - BHAGALPUR

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajive Ranjan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Renu Kumari, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD  
ORAL ORDER**

4      28-07-2021              Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code, however, at some place he has mentioned Section 302 Indian Penal Code which is incorrect.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner in the present case is seeking regular bail in connection with Nathnagar (Madhusudanpur) P.S. Case No. 94 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 307 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

As per the prosecution story, the petitioner called the informant and asked him to come with him. The informant went

to the house of this petitioner and saw one Md. Bashar there. The petitioner asked the informant to stay at his house overnight. The informant stayed there and in the night petitioner asked him to come with him to Gauripur Bhatta and after reaching there the petitioner got a call on his mobile and after that he fired upon the informant which hit him on the back side and he fell down there and the petitioner fled away. The informant called his wife who came at the place of occurrence and took him to hospital where he is undergoing treatment.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that there is no eye-witness to the present occurrence. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.05.2020.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the specific allegation against the petitioner that he has fired upon the informant causing serious injury on his body, the huge number of criminal antecedents of the petitioner and his custody only since 14.05.2020, this Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. The prayer for bail is

thus refused. Let the trial be expedited.

Learned trial court shall make all endeavours to conclude the trial expeditiously as early as possible and preferably within a period of one year from the date of start of normal functioning of the court. If the trial remains unconcluded during this period for no reason attributable to the petitioner, he may renew his prayer for bail.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

Rishi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.