

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55361 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2024 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

1. ANIL YADAV SON OF NAGESHWAR YADAV @ NAESHWAR YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - AKURAHA, TOLA - BHARWA, P.S. -
TANKUPPA, DISTRICT - GAYA
2. SURENDRA YADAV @ SURESH YADAV SON OF BUDHAN YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - AKURAHA, TOLA - BHARWA, P.S. -
TANKUPPA, DISTRICT - GAYA
3. KAUSAL YADAV @ KAUSAL KUMAR SON OF BUDHAN YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - AKURAHA, TOLA - BHARWA, P.S. -
TANKUPPA, DISTRICT - GAYA
4. RAJU KUMAR @ RAJU YADAV SON OF SIDHESHWAR YADAV
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - AKURAHA, TOLA - BHARWA, P.S. -
TANKUPPA, DISTRICT - GAYA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prithivi Raj Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammed Arif

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 14-08-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well
as the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are seeking regular bail in connection with Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 45 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 326, 307, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation, the informant was returning from his agricultural field to his residence, the accused persons including the petitioner came there and started abusing and assaulting them. Thereafter, petitioner no. 1 brought out country made pistol from his waist and fired at the son of the informant, due to which he sustained injuries.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that the allegation of firing at the injured is not attributed against the petitioners, rather it is against co-accused Anil Yadav. He has also submitted that the injuries are simple in nature. The petitioners are under custody since 02.04.2024.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant has submitted that though there is no allegation of firing against the petitioner but he assisted the main accused, after catching hold of the injured. He has further submitted that the petitioners have criminal antecedents.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the allegation and also the fact that the petitioners have criminal antecedents, I do not think it to be a fit case for bail, which is hereby rejected.

7. The petitioners may renew their prayer for bail after completion of six months under custody in the court below itself.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/-

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

