

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17869 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2024 Thana- RANIYATALAB District- Patna

Krishna Yadav S/O Late Chhotu Yadav Resident of village - Jiten Chapra,
P.S- Rani Talab, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rakesh Bihari Singh, Adv
For the Informant	:	Mr. Shyam Kishore, Adv
		Mr. Suman Anand, Adv
For the State	:	Mr. Brajendra Nath Pandey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 18-06-2025 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Ranitalab P.S. Case No. 72 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable u/s 302, 307, 341, 323, 354 (B), 379, 504 and 506 read with Section 34 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner had assaulted with *Khanti* on the temple of one Govind Sharan Yadav (informant's husband), who subsequently died during the course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in



this case. It is further submitted that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. It is further submitted that similarly situated co-accused persons, namely, Madan Yadav, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 13.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 85634 of 2024. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent and is in custody since 17.08.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and have stated that there is a specific allegation against the petitioner to have assaulted the husband of the informant due to which he died during the course of treatment and the post-mortem report corroborates the allegations levelled in the FIR against the petitioner, hence, he does not deserve the liberty of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and also taking into account the nature of allegation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and the same is hereby rejected.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Jyoti/-

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

