

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13733 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-55 Year-2018 Thana- DUMARIYA District- Gaya

Sharwan Yadav @ Ranjeet Yadav @ Bajaria Son of Jhari Yadav R/o vill -
Orwan Tand, P.S. - Maigra, Distt. - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md. Javed Jafar Khan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 10-05-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 353, 504 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 25(1-b), 26, 27 and 35 of the Arms Act, Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Explosive Substance Act and Sections 16, 18 and 20 of the UPA Act.

3. Considering the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail in connection with Dumariya P.S. Case No. 55 of 2018 pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Sherghati, Gaya/Successor Court as the informant alleges that he got secret information that the accused persons including the petitioner along with unknown accused were active members of Maoist movement are planning to commit extortion, recruitment of new



recruits including carrying out deadly attack on armed forces.

4. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that similarly situated co-accused Mandeep Yadav @ Matal has been granted the privilege of regular bail by an order dated 03.11.2021 in Cr. Misc. No. 44948 of 2021 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court placing reliance on an order dated 09.09.2021 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 93220 of 2021 and also taking into consideration the period of custody.

6. Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order dated 03.11.2021, it would manifest that similarly situated co-accused was in custody since 18.04.2020 and 30.07.2020 whereas this petitioner is in custody since 02.07.2023, as such, the petitioner is not liable to be released on bail.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

