

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65712 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2023 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

SUNNY YADAV SON OF PARMOD YADAV RESIDENT OF VILLAGE -  
SHANKARPUR MILKI, P.S. - MUFFASIL, DISTRICT – MUNGER

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Jyoti Ranjan Jha, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP  |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Rana Veer Prawar, Advocate |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      13-12-2023

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Muffasil P.S Case no.132 of 2023 registered under sections 302, 307, 147, 148, 149, 385, 324, 326, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the accused persons including the petitioner herein are said to have come variously armed. It is stated that on the informant resisting their illegal demand to provide grains, on the orders of Nakul Yadav, Bhisma Kumar resorted to firing as a result of which one Anubhav Kumar sustained gunshot injury in his chest and died. It is further stated that the petitioner resorted to firing resulting in gunshot injury to one Chandan who is being treated in the



hospital.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The allegation of firing on the deceased is specific on Bhisma Kumar. So far as the petitioner is concerned, there is no injury report of Chandan on record. The petitioner is in custody since 24.5.2023 and investigation in the case has concluded. A number of persons have been enlarged on bail.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that from the contents of the F.I.R, it would be evident that the petitioner actively participated in the occurrence wherein one person died and others sustained injuries. There is direct allegation against the petitioner of having resorted to firing.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR, one person having died in the occurrence, the allegation against the petitioner of having resorted to firing on one Chandan, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his



prayer for bail after framing of charge.

**(Partha Sarthy, J)**

Shiv/-

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

