

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16955 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-474 Year-2024 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

Arvind Kumar Yadav @ Arvind Yadav S/O Arun Yadav Resident of village -
Ramghat Bairakh, Ward no.- 12, P.S- Raniganj, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gopal Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 18-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Raniganj P.S. Case No. 474 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 310(2) of the BNS and Sections 25(1-b), 26, 27
of the Arms Act.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that six unknown
miscreants made indiscriminate firing upon the informant and
his associates, looted around Rs. 8,78,000/- from him and fled
away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner 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 during investigation. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner has got no concern with the looted articles. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 27.10.2024 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that as per the material available in the case diary, the co-accused person namely Rahul Yadav has himself confessed his guilt and disclosed the manner in which he along with other associates including this petitioner committed the alleged offence and on the basis of the disclosure made by him, the firearm used in the alleged occurrence has also been recovered, and therefore, the petitioner may not be released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, material available in the case diary as also the nature and gravity of offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

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



8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

