

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24904 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2024 Thana- Mau District- Gaya

Sonu Kumar @ Sonu Yadav S/o Muneshwar Yadav @ Sakal Yadav Resident
of village- Kurkut Bigha, P.S.- Mau, Distt.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yogesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Anil Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-04-2025 Heard Mr. Yogesh Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Anil Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 07 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 05.04.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Section 147, 148, 323, 324, 325, 341, 342, 307, 427, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution story, in brief, is that while informant in presence of his father, uncle and cousins harvesting the crops on 05.04.2024 at 09:02 A.M., meanwhile 9-10 persons of village came and abused as well as assaulted them. Allegation made by the informant that Ranjeet Yadav assaulted Ram Prakash Sharma with Pasuli consequently he got fainted and fell on the ground, thereupon Rakesh Yadav, Birendra Yadav



and Ravi Yadav assaulted his father with iron rod and thus he got injuries on his hands and legs. Furthermore, Bhubneshwar Yadav, Puttu Yadav and Sanjay Yadav assaulted Janeshwar Sharma with Gadasa & Lathi upon his knee and all the accused were aided by Krishna Yadav, Sonu Yadav and Uday.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that F.I.R. is in two parts, in first part, there is specific allegation of assault is against co-accused persons namely, Ranjeet Yadav, Rakesh Yadav, Birendra Yadav and Ravi Yadav and in the second part, there is allegation against the petitioner that he along with other co-accused persons have carried the pistol but there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act or firing attributed against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that co-accused person namely Ranjeet Yadav against whom there is specific allegation of assault has been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.01.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 88155 of



2024.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph-3 of the bail petition that the petitioner is on bail in the pending matter.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts that there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act attributed against the petitioner and co-accused person namely Ranjeet Yadav @ Ranjeet Kumar has been granted the privilege of bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gaya in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 07 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions :-

(1) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court



and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(2) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(3) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ibrar//-

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

