

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22176 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2024 Thana- BHEJA District- Madhubani

Tirpeet Narayan Yadav Son of Late Laxman Yadav Resident of Village -
Darah Navtoliya, P.S. - Bheja, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sameer Ranjan, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Adv.

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

ORAL ORDER

4 07-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State as also learned counsel for the Informant.
Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bheja
P.S. Case No. 104 of 2024 instituted for the offences under
Sections 329(4), 126(2), 115(2), 118, 109, 75, 303(2), 324(4),
352, 351(2) and Section 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
petitioner is of assaulting the informant with iron pipe on his
head causing serious injury which ultimately resulted into his
death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to dirty village politics and old enmities. He further submits that the F.I.R. has been lodged against nine named accused persons and fifty unknown persons. He further submits that there is delay of 8-9 days in lodging the F.I.R. that too without there being any plausible explanation for the same which creates doubt in the veracity of the prosecution case. He further submits that the Informant in his written report has alleged that Sunil Kumar Yadav has assaulted on his head by spade/kudal due to which he sustained head injury but, the doctor has found the nature of injuries as simple in nature and caused by hard and blunt substance. He further submits that the deceased has died due to wrong treatments/operation conducted by the doctors at private hospital. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is only the order giver. The petitioner has six criminal antecedents and, in all of them, he is on bail and is languishing in judicial custody since 22.11.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State and the Informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged is serious in



nature.

6. From perusal of records, it appears that though in the F.I.R., there is an allegation against the petitioner of being an order giver but, from perusal of the records, it appears that several injured witnesses have stated that the petitioner has assaulted the informant by means of iron pipe upon his head due to which he succumbed to the injury.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

