

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14975 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2024 Thana- HULASGANJ District- Jehanabad

Sanjay Yadav @ Sanjay Kumar S/o Doman Yadav R/o Village- Nandan
Bigha, PS- Hulasganj, District- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 22098 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2024 Thana- HULASGANJ District- Jehanabad

Vikash Yadav @ Vikash Kumar S/O Doman Yadav R/O Village- Nandan
Bigha, P.S- Hulasganj, Distt.- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 14975 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate
: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Bachan Jee Ojha, Advocate
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 22098 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate
: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ajeet Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant : Mr. Bachan Jee Ojha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

4 23-07-2025 Heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioners,

learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners seek regular bail in connection with

Hulasganj P.S. Case No. 155 of 2024 registered for the offence

under Sections 341, 323, 325, 302, 307, 504, 506/34 of the



Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, it is alleged that due to old land dispute between the parties the petitioners and others started assaulting the informant. It is further alleged that the petitioners and others started making indiscriminate firing due to which the brother of the informant was badly injured.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that the deceased has died after six days of occurrence and because of the pending land dispute, the occurrence has taken place, therefore, the petitioners deserve bail. The petitioners are in custody since 18.06.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that out of nine witnesses, three witnesses have already been examined in the trial and the informant is ready to get examined other witnesses on the date fixed in the trial and the informant will not delay the trial.

6. Considering the serious gravity of the offence, the allegation against the petitioners is of firing, the postmortem report and also the fact that the trial has proceeded, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this application for regular bail is



hereby rejected.

8. If the trial is delayed by the prosecution, the
petitioners may renew their prayer for bail.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

anand/-

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

