

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31281 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-168 Year-2024 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

Amle Yadav @ MLA Yadav @ MLA S/O Kamli Yadav R/O Vill- Khurd
Diyara, P.O Bishnupur Ahok, P.S- Sahebpur Kamal, Dist.-Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Bhubneshwar Mahto, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 21-05-2025 Heard Mr. Arvind Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner; Mr. Bhubneshwar Mahto, learned counsel for the

informant and Mr. Shantanu Kumar, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection
with Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 168 of 2024 registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 147, 341, 386, 302, 379,
120B, 504 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that one Kamli Yadav
stated that if Gopal Sahni did not provide a *ransom* of Rupees
Five Lacs, he would not be allowed to take away the fish. He
also ordered to kill Gopal Sahni, and on his order, one Bengali
Yadav fired three shots at Gopal Sahni, who died, In the first



part of the FIR, the names of six accused persons, including the petitioner, are mentioned.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that though the name of this petitioner has surfaced in the first part of the FIR, a perusal of the second part of the FIR reveals that there is a specific allegation against Kamli Yadav, who gave the order, and Bengali Yadav, who executed the firing. He further submits that the petitioner was in Tripura at the time of the incident, and to support this argument, he has presented Exhibit P/2 before this Court, This Exhibit is a letter written by Md. Babul Miyan, stating that the petitioner had gone to West Tripura for his livelihood and was employed in his company. However, Annexure-P/2 series is not supported by any attendance sheet or railway ticket. In any view of the matter, the petitioner is, at most, the member of the mob; there is no specific allegation against him. He also submits that the petitioner is local criminal and his work is to collect *ransom*, but from perusal of the bail petition of the petitioner, it transpires that there is no criminal antecedent of this petitioner. A statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner



has no criminal antecedent. He further submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 21.01.2025.

5. The learned counsel for the informant and learned counsel for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub-Judge-IV-cum-ACJM IV, Begusarai in connection with Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 168 of 2024.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

