

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48933 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-142 Year-2024 Thana- JAHANABAD District- Jehanabad

Sanoj Yadav Son Of Late Rajnandan Yadav R/O- Village- Kamaru Bigha  
Mahua Tola, P.S.-DISTT.- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Birendra Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP

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

3      18-09-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Jehanabad P.S. Case No. 142 of 2024 dated 17.02.2024, lodged under Sections 363, 365, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and later on, sections 411, 364, 302, 201 and 120(B) of the IPC has been added pending before the Court of Additional District Judge-1st, Jehanabad.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against two named accused persons including the present petitioner and one unknown accused person against whom there is an allegation that they had taken the informant's husband with them but, subsequently, he did not returned to his house.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel submits that the name of the petitioner has been figured in this case only by virtue of the confessional statement. Counsel further submits that it has been alleged in the FIR that on 16.02.2024, informant's husband went with two accused persons including the petitioner and did not return to his house, but subsequently, during investigation, the dead body of informant's husband was found. Counsel further submits that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is clean and he is ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon him.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that it is true that FIR has been lodged on the basis of suspicion only due to the reason that the informant's husband leave the house with two accused persons including the petitioner and subsequently, the dead body of the informant's husband was found. Counsel further submits that on earlier occasion, case diary has been called for and from the case diary, it transpires that the petitioner along with other accused persons have killed the informant's husband.

6. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the  
petitioner is hereby rejected.

**(Dr. Anshuman, J)**

Divyansh/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

