

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35334 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-768 Year-2024 Thana- AMARPUR District- Banka

Mithun Yadav @ Prince Kumar S/o Late Gopal Yadav Resident Of Village-
Badi Mirzapur, PS.- Kasim Bazar, Distt. Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 05-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Amarpur P.S. Case No. 768 of 2024 instituted for the offence
under Sections 310(4), 310(5) & 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 35 & 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. The prosecution case, as per the F.I.R., is that on
02.12.2024, the police received secret information about a
planned robbery by the petitioner's gang near Mahadeva Pokhar.
Two accused, Ankit Kumar and Lalu Yadav, were apprehended
with firearms and ammunition, while others escaped after firing
at the police. During interrogation, the arrested individuals



named their associates, including the petitioner.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 10-03-2025. Petitioner bears nineteen (19) criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Name of the petitioner is disclosed by the apprehended co-accused person. Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. There is no compliance of Section 103 of the BNSS, 2023. There is no material against the petitioner in the present case. Other co-accused has been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 27-02-2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9971 of 2025.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is contended that petitioner bears nineteen (19) criminal antecedents, hence, he does not deserve the privilege of bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, specifically taking into account nineteen (19) criminal antecedents of the petitioner, this Court at this stage is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of



bail is hereby *rejected*.

8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

9. However, petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today in the court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

