

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13060 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2023 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Anil Yadav, Male, aged about 50 years, Son of Late Narayan Yadav, R/O
village – Pokhram, Ward No. 3, P.S.- Murliganj, Dist- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amarnath Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party : Mr. Khurshid Anwar, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 200 of 2023 dated 27.05.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 342, 386, 302, 120B, 504, 506 of the I.P.C. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 26.05.2023 at about 10.00 A.M., the informant alongwith her husband Dilip Kumar was going to Murliganj on his motorcycle and as soon as they reached at about 1.5 K.M., from her house in the village- Tilkoda, near the canal, she saw that Anil Yadav (petitioner), Bauya Yadav, Shravan Kumar, Vijay Kumar, Sunil Verma,



Nitish Kumar and other unknown miscreants having weapons in their hands surrounded the husband of the informant. The informant and her husband got down from the motorcycle and stood there due to fear. It is further alleged that Anil Yadav (petitioner) told the husband of the informant by abusing him that he is demanding Rs. 5,00,000/- as ransom for the last six months and he also called him on phone but he did not heed about it and now he identified him as criminal. On which, on the order of Sunil Verma to kill the informant's husband, Anil Yadav (petitioner) fired which hit on his chest, Bauya Yadav fired which hit on his chest near the arm, Nitish Kumar fired which hit on the temporal region thereafter he fell down on the ground. It is further alleged that the co-accused Shravan Kumar and Vijay Kumar have also fired which hit on his body. Thereafter, her husband became unconscious. It is further alleged that on the hearing of sound of firing and hulla raised by the informant, nearby people assembled there. At that time, her husband died. It is further alleged that earlier, the residents of the said Panchayat, Rita Verma, Rekha Devi, Ravindra Baitha and Dharendra Ram threatened them to kill. It is further alleged that the informant came to know through the local people that in the said occurrence, Kunal Kumar, Ashish Yadav, Raj Kishore



Kumar were working as liner. It is further alleged that the informant believed that the aforesaid named persons and other unknown criminals in a conspiracy with each other have committed the said occurrence. The dead body of the deceased was sent by the police for postmortem.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that during the course of investigation, the police could not collect any cogent material against the petitioner. The supplementary charge sheet has been submitted in the present case for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 342, 386, 302, 120B, 504, 506 of the I.P.C., Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 27, 35 of the Arms Act, Sections 8, 20,(b) (ii)(A) and 25 of the N.D.P.S. Act. The petitioner is a social worker and due to local village politics, he has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that there is no independent witness to the alleged offence and all the witnesses examined during the course of investigation are family members of the informant. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. No incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has five criminal antecedents as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the



bail petition. The petitioner is in custody in this case since 17.02.2024.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail petition of the petitioner and has further submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. He further submits that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused persons fired on the husband of the informant, due to which, he died. The postmortem report also suggests the cause of death 'Haemorrhage and shock due to above mentioned injury by firearm (Gunshot).

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the heinous nature of accusation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is rejected in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 200 of 2023, pending in the court of learned District and Sessions Judge, Madehpura.

7. The application stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

