

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17497 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-106 Year-2024 Thana- LAXMIPUR District- Jamui

Parmod Yadav Son of Suffal Yadav Resident of Village- Maghi, P.S.-
Laxmipur, Distt.- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 19-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Laxmipur P.S. Case No. 106 of 2024 instituted for the
offences under Sections 147, 341, 342, 302 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the accusation against
the accused persons including the petitioner is of committing the
murder of the informant's wife namely Pabiya Devi. It is also
alleged that the accused persons also tried to kill the informant
as well but, somehow, he managed to flee away from the place
of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused Madan Yadav given after a long delay of about two months. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner rather the specific allegation of commission of murder is alleged against the other co-accused persons. Petitioner is nowhere connected with the alleged occurrence and he has no concern with the family affairs of the deceased and the informant. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has four criminal antecedents. The co-accused person has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 18.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 62559 of 2024.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the nature and gravity of offence, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail, and hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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



8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

