

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33945 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2021 Thana- OBRA District- Aurangabad

Udal Yadav @ Udal Kumar Yadav @ Udal Kumar @ Saket@ Udal Kumar
Yadi S/O Late Ramdeep Yadav Village- Dewan Bigha, Ker Tola Daulatpur,
P.S.- Konch, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Rakesh Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-05-2025 Heard Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, learned senior counsel
for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for
the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 379, 384, 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The allegation in the First Information Report is
against five named persons that they were involved in
demanding Rangdari from the informant, who is an owner of
brick kiln.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits
that a perusal of the First Information Report itself would go to



show that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and in the said FIR the names of five accused persons have been specifically taken against whom there is an allegation of demand of ransom. So far as the petitioner is concerned, it has been submitted that the name of the petitioner has transpired in the confessional statement of one of the accused Mukesh Kumar given in another case being Goh P.S. Case No. 107 of 2021 and it is only on the basis of such confessional statement of co-accused made before the police in another case, which would have no evidentiary value, that the petitioner was made an accused in this case and was arrested. Further, it is clarified that the petitioner is not an accused in Goh P.S. Case No. 107 of 2021. It has also been submitted that the concerned mobile which has been mentioned in the FIR also does not belong to the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 18.03.2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail on the ground that petitioner has criminal antecedents. In response to the same, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is on bail in all the cases.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioner be enlarged on bail on



furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Obra P.S. Case No. 89 of 2021, subject to the conclusion that:

(I) One of the bailors would be the family member or relative.

(II) The petitioner would appear physically on each and every date in the learned court below till the framing of charge and would cooperate in the conclusion of trial and if the petitioner does not appear on any date without any substantial and satisfactory reason, the learned court below would be at liberty to cancel his bail bonds.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

