

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50279 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2020 Thana- MIRGANJ District- Gopalganj

SONU YADAV @ KRISHNA YADAV S/o Garju Yadav @ Garju Chaudhary  
Resident of Village- Sareya, P.S.- Husainganj, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Bardhan Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kalyan Shankar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

6      25-01-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Mirganj P.S. Case No. 12 of 2020 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, it is alleged that on 12.1.2020 when the husband of the informant was at service center near NH-85, in the meantime, Kaushal Kumar Singh along with unknown miscreants started indiscriminate firing due to which informant's husband Arun Kumar Singh sustained injury and died.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. The petitioner is not named in the FIR. His name came into light during course of investigation. No specific allegation of firing against him. He has falsely been implicated in this case. Moreover, the petitioner was remanded in this case on 18.12.2020 and since then, he is languishing in judicial custody.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that although the petitioner is not named in the FIR, he was arrested during course of investigation. Thereafter, he has confessed his guilt in his self confessional statement vide para 25 of the case diary wherein, he stated that he along with others committed murder of the informant's husband Arun Kumar Singh by firearm. The witnesses of the case have supported the prosecution case. It is also submitted that the petitioner is a notorious person who has got nine criminal antecedents.

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



7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial  
and conclude the same as soon as possible.

**(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)**

Amandeep/-

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

