

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45205 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-629 Year-2023 Thana- SIMRI BAKHTIYARPUR District-
Saharsa

=====

Anil Yadav @ Anil Kumar Yadav Son Of Hakim Yadav Resident Of Vill-
Kathdumar Tole-Izraha, Ward No.- 01, P.S.- Simri Bakhtiyarpur (Kanariya
O.P.), District- Sahara.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amarnath Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 28-06-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Simri
Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No. 629 of 2023 instituted for the
offences under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 504, 506/34 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the allegation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of assaulting the
informant and his brother. It is alleged that this petitioner
opened fire which hit at the abdomen of the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. There is an admitted land dispute between the parties. The petitioner is in custody since 04.04.2024 and has three criminal antecedents.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the application for bail and submitted that petitioner is named in the FIR. There is specific allegation of firing to the informant is against the petitioner due to which he sustained injury. From perusal of the injury report, it appears that the injury sustained to the informant is grievous in nature. During investigation several witnesses have also supported the prosecution case.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the specific allegation of firing against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. Hence, trial Court is directed to conclude the trial within six months, failing which, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Arish/-

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

