

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38882 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-73 Year-2025 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

Vijay Yadav, S/o Late Mathura Yadav, R/o vill - Mubarakpur, PS- Manjhi,
District- Saran at Chhapra, Bihar. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 40250 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-73 Year-2025 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

1. Manish Yadav S/o Akshay Lal Yadav, R/o Narwan Tola, PS- Manjhi,
District- Saran at Chhapra.
2. Rahul Yadav S/o Late Dinesh Yadav R/o Mubarakpur, P.s.- Manjhi, Distt.-
Saran at Chhapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 38882 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Apurv Harsh, Advocate
Mr. Raghu Raj Pratap, Advocate
Mr. Hritik Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 40250 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Apurv Harsh, Advocate
Mr. Raghu Raj Pratap, Advocate
Mr. Hritik Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandye, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

6 11-12-2025

Cr. Misc. No. 38882 of 2025

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Manjhi
P.S. Case No. 73/2025 registered for the offence under Sections
103, 109, 127, 352, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and



Sections 25(1-B)/26/35 of Arms Act.

3. The accused/petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and is in custody since 05.03.2025.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is to commit murder of uncle of the informant by causing firearm injuries on 02.03.2025 at about 10:00 PM while his uncle was returning after attending marriage party from a nearby village.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the informant is not the *eye-witness* of the occurrence. It is pointed out that the allegation of firing is not available against this petitioner. It is submitted that still the matter is at stage of prosecution evidence and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.

6. Learned APP duly assisted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that it is the deceased who informed soon before death over telephone to the informant *qua* involvement of petitioner in the occurrence alongwith other five named persons, out of whom, one opened fire upon him, which proved fatal. It is submitted that as per *postmortem* report, death of uncle of the informant was caused due to firearm injury. It is also submitted by learned counsel appearing for the informant that the progress of



trial is satisfactory and since August, 2025 almost seven charge-sheeted witnesses were examined by the learned trial court out of eleven and, therefore, the trial is likely to conclude in near future. It is also pointed out that this petitioner found involved in two more criminal cases of similar nature. Taking a contrary note, it is submitted by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that in both criminal cases, the petitioner is on bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact as the FIR which is based upon the information supplied by deceased himself over telephone, suggesting active involvement of this petitioner with crime in question, coupled with the fact that progress of trial also appears satisfactory as discussed aforesaid, accordingly, the prayer of bail of petitioner stands rejected for the present.

8. As petitioner remains in custody since 05.03.2025, the learned trial court is directed to conclude the trial, positively within four months, failing which the petitioner is at liberty to renew his prayer of bail, if so advised.

Cr. Misc. No. 40250 of 2025

1. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Manjhi



P.S. Case No. 73/2025 registered for the offence under Sections 103, 109, 127, 352, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)/26/27/35 of Arms Act.

3. The accused/petitioners are named in the F.I.R. and are in custody since 05.03.2025.

4. The allegation against the petitioners is to commit murder of uncle of the informant by causing firearm injuries on 02.03.2025 at about 10:00 PM while his uncle was returning after attending marriage party from a nearby village.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that the informant is not the *eye-witness* of the occurrence. It is pointed out that the allegation of firing is not available against these petitioners. It is submitted that still the matter is at stage of prosecution evidence and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.

6. Learned APP duly assisted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that it is the deceased who informed soon before death over telephone to the informant *qua* involvement of petitioners in the occurrence alongwith other five named persons, out of whom, one opened fire upon him, which proved fatal. It is submitted that as per *postmortem* report, death of uncle of the



informant was caused due to firearm injury. It is also submitted by learned counsel appearing for the informant that the progress of trial is satisfactory and since August, 2025 almost seven charge-sheeted witnesses were examined by the learned trial court out of eleven and, therefore, the trial is likely to conclude in near future.

7. Considering the aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact as the FIR which is based upon the information supplied by deceased himself over telephone, suggesting active involvement of these petitioners with crime in question, coupled with the fact that progress of trial also appears satisfactory as discussed aforesaid, accordingly, the prayer of bail of petitioners stand rejected for the present.

8. As petitioners remain in custody since 05.03.2025, the learned trial court is directed to conclude the trial, positively within four months, failing which the petitioners is at liberty to renew their prayer of bail, if so advised.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

veena/-

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

