

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26780 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-266 Year-2023 Thana- PANDARAK District- Patna

Parsuram Kumar @ Pasa, S/o- Mr. Brahmdeo Yadav, R/o Village- Gwash
Shekhpura, P.S.- Pandarak, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 41436 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-266 Year-2023 Thana- PANDARAK District- Patna

Subodh Yadav, Son of Late Haran Yadav, R/o Village- Gherapar Beldari PS-
Pandarak District- Patna. Permanent R/o-Village Shekhpura PS- Pandarak
District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 26780 of 2024)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kr. Thakur, Advocate
Ms. Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Murli Dhar, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 41436 of 2024)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shivnandan Bharti, Advocate
Ms. Kalyani Singh, Advocate
Mr. Pintu Kumar Patel, Advocate
Mr. Gaurav Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

- 312-07-2024
1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners have preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Pandarak P.S. Case no. 266 of 2023 registered under sections 302, 120B, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states



that on the orders of Subodh Yadav while Parsuram Kumar @ Pasa and Janak Kumar caught hold of his son, Ayush Kumar is stated to have fired on him with his pistol as a result of which he sustained firearm injury and died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner- Parsuram Kumar submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. No over act has been alleged against him. Ayush Kumar is said to be the sole assailant and in the postmortem report only one firearm injury has been found. The petitioner is in custody since 28.11.2023 and undertakes to cooperate in the case.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner- Subodh Yadav submits that the petitioner has only been named as an order giver in the case. No overt act has been alleged against him. He is custody since 14.11.2023.

6. The prayer for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P for the State.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioners in the F.I.R., the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail and the application is rejected.

8. Liberty is granted to the petitioners to renew their



prayer for bail after six months or on framing of charge,
whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/-

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

