

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86686 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2024 Thana- GOGRI District- Khagaria

Govind Yadav @ Govind Kumar Son of Ramratan Yadav Resident of Village
- Usari, P.S. - Gogri, District -Khagaria (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Seema Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 11-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
G.R. No. 111 of 2024, arising out of Gogri P.S. Case No. 19 of
2024, registered under Sections 447, 341, 323, 307, 379, 506, 34
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that, petitioner
along with other co-accused persons went to the house of the
informant and took fertilizers. On raising objection by the son of
the informant, the petitioner fired upon him due to which he
sustained injury in legs. It is further alleged that the petitioner
has also fired on the informant.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that as per allegation, the petitioner has fired in the leg of son of the informant due to which he sustained injury but no fired cartridge has been recovered from the place of occurrence. The petitioner has got two criminal antecedents in which he is on bail in both the cases. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that similarly situated co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 27.09.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 66259 of 2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is further submitted that specific allegation of firing upon informant and his son is against the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall



consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being
prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

