

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59523 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-300 Year-2022 Thana- MADANPUR District- Aurangabad

Laddu Yadav @ Sanjit Yadav S/o Manitar Yadav R/V- Khaira, P.S.- Amas,
Distt- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhaskar Shankar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramchandra Sahni, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 16-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State in virtual court
proceeding.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be
removed within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 385, 387,
435, 341, 447, 120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

According to prosecution case, three unknown
miscreants set two tractors of the informant on fire on
11.06.2022. The miscreants also took away two mobile phones.
It is further alleged they left a chip of paper over which T.P.C.
has been written. Subodh Yadav and Renu Devi are involved in
this offence. He further stated that two months before the
occurrence, Subhash Yadav who is the member of T.P.C.



demanded bricks from the informant free of cost on which he refused. At that time he threatened him to set his tractor on fire.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that in fact the petitioner was not named in the F.I.R. and the name of the has transpired on the basis of restatement of the informant. He further submits that in fact the petitioner is son-in-law of the co-accused Subhash Yadav and the allegation against the Subhash Yadav that who fired the brick kiln of the informant and set his two tractors on fire and who is a member of T.P.C. He further submits that it appears from the F.I.R. that there is no role of the petitioners in the present occurrence that he is only son-in-law of the co-accused namely, Subhash Yadav and during investigation no cogent material has come during investigation against the petitioner.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the



satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Madanpur P.S. Case No. 300 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

1. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

3. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

mdrashid/-

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

