

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30626 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-234 Year-2023 Thana- SALIMPUR District- Patna

Bablu Kumar @ Bablu Yadav S/O Ram Pravesh Yadav R/O Village- Shahpur,
P.S- Salimpur, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kr. Thakur, Adv. Mrs. Vaishnavi Singh, Adv. Mr. Ritwik Thakur, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 09-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner has earlier moved before this Court with a prayer for anticipatory bail which was rejected vide order dated 25.06.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 31866 of 2024.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Salimpur P.S. Case No. 234 of 2023 instituted for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307, 302 of Indian Penal Code.

4. The allegation against the petitioner along with others is of brutally assaulting the uncle and brother of the informant due to which the brother of the informant died.

5. 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 old enmity. There is a case and counter case between the parties. The present case is the counter blast to Salimpur P.S. Case No. 235 of 2023. There is no specific or direct allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. The Informant, who is alleged to be the eye-witness to the alleged occurrence, has not made any accusation against the petitioner. He further submits that in the alleged occurrence, both the parties have sustained injuries. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner had no intention to kill the brother of the informant. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 05.08.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner again submits that the co-accused namely Shanshan Yadav @ Shailesh Singh has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 10.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 19739 of 2024. He further submits that the co-accused Volki Devi has also been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 04.03.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 13106 of 2024.

7. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious



in nature. He further submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the deceased by means of sword. He further submits that the witness Babita Devi, Raju Kumar, Dhanesh Kumar and Chandan Kumar have in their statement have supported the prosecution case. The postmortem report also supports the prosecution case.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as also there being direct allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the deceased by means of sword, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

9. 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.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

