

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 9839 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-442 Year-2022 Thana- MADANPUR District- Aurangabad

Pappu Kumar @ Chhotu SON OF Dwarika Yadav RESIDENT OF  
VILLAGE- JAMUNIYA, PS- MADANPUR, DIST- AURANGABAD

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aman Vishal

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      16-04-2024                                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Madanpur P.S. Case No. 490 of 2022 registered on 25.09.2022 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 353, 307, 120B of the I.P.C. and Section 25 (1-b)a, 26, 35 of the Arms Act and Section 3 4 5 of the Explosives Act, 1884 and Sections 13, 16, 18, 20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967.

3. As per the prosecution case, F.I.R. has been lodged against 33 named and 10 unknown accused persons against whom there is an allegation that they are involved in Maoist activities.

4. Counsel further submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He further submits that petitioner



is in custody since 03.08.2023 having five criminal case pending against him. Counsel for the petitioner submits that at the instance of police machinery, he has been declared *Ugravadi*. He further submits that no cogent material has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioner is the core member of organization who are involved in anti-national activities and it is due to this reason U.A.P.A. Act has been added.

6. Upon specific query made by this Court that whether charge has been framed or not, counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not aware of this fact that charge has been framed or not.

7. In the present facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. However, petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

**(Dr. Anshuman, J)**

Sunnykr/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

