

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28122 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-37 Year-2024 Thana- HUSSAINGANJ District- Siwan

Krishna Yadav @ Sonu Yadav Son of Late Garju Yadav R/O Vill- Sareya,
P.S.- Hussainganj, District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raghav Prasad, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tarun Prasad Mandal, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 12-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Hussainganj P.S. Case No. 37 of 2024 instituted for the
offences under Section 386 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the unknown caller has
called the Informant four times from mobile no. 6393859339,
demanding five lakh rupees as *rangdari*.

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.
The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and his name has
surfaced in this case on the basis of the confessional statement



of the co-accused Abhishek Yadav. The petitioner is the owner of the alleged mobile no. 6393859339 from which ransom of five lakh rupees was demanded. The petitioner is neither owner nor has got any concern with the aforesaid mobile number, in question. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has eight criminal antecedents and is languishing in judicial custody since 18.10.2024 without any rhymes or reason.

5. 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 is serious in nature. Though the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. but, his name has surfaced in this case on the confessional statement of the co-accused Abhishek Yadav. The petitioner has eight criminal antecedents of heinous nature of offence and, hence, he does not deserve bail.

6. Having heard rival contention of both the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence as also the petitioner having eight criminal antecedents, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner,



above named, is rejected with a liberty to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail before the learned court below after framing of charge.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

