

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28437 of 2025

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

Navin Kumar @ Navin Yadav 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 :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Mayank Raj, Advocate Mr. Rahul Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Bachhanjee Ojha, Advocate Mr. Navin Kumar Jha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA
ORAL ORDER

4 03-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Hulasganj P.S. Case No. 155 of 2024 dated 17.06.2024,
instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323,
325, 302, 307, 504, 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along
with other accused persons indiscriminately fired upon
Dharamvir Yadav (brother of informant) due to which he
succumbed to injuries and subsequently died during the course
of treatment.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that both the sides are agnates. There is a case and counter case between the parties. Counter case bearing Hulasganj P.S. Case No. 156 of 2024 has been filed by the petitioner's side against the informant and others. It is next submitted that father of the petitioner namely, Doman Yadav having more or less similar allegation has been granted bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 17.02.2025 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 87441 of 2024. Lastly, it has been submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 18.06.2024 having no criminal antecedents and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case.

5. Learned A.P.P. and learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that there is a specific allegation of firing against the petitioner.

6. Earlier, a report was called for from the concerned court about the stage of the case which has been received and it reveals that three witnesses have been examined and one private witness, two doctors and one I.O. are yet to be examined.

7. Having considered the facts and circumstances of



the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

9. However, the learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and take all endeavour to conclude the trial at the earliest, preferably, within a period of nine (09) months from the date of receipt or production of a copy of this order.

(Khatim Reza, J)

Sankalp/-

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

