

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35243 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-345 Year-2024 Thana- TRIVENIGANJ District- Supaul

1. Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwar Yadav S/o Ayodhi Yadav Resident of village - Lakshminiya, Ward No. 08, Police Station - Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
2. Subhash Yadav Son of Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwar Yadav Resident of village - Lakshminiya, Ward No. 08, Police Station - Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
3. Lallu Yadav @ Lallu Kumar @Laltu Kumar Son of Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwar Yadav Resident of village - Lakshminiya, Ward No. 08, Police Station - Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul
4. Rabindra Yadav @ Ravindra Kumar @ Ravindra Yadav Son of Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwari Yadav @ Singheshwar Yadav Resident of village - Lakshminiya, Ward No. 08, Police Station - Triveniganj, Distt.- Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arun, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mrs.Renuka Ratnakar, APP.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar Srivastava, Advocate.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 18-12-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners seek pre-arrest bail in connection with Triveniganj P.S. Case No. 345 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 303(2), 352, 351(2), 74, 109(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per the allegation made in the F.I.R., all the



accused persons with a common intention to kill the informant, his son and other family members brutally assaulted them with a sharp cutting weapon causing injury.

4. Mr. Arun, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submitted that there is case and counter case between the parties arising out of the same occurrence in which both the parties sustained injury and in the said course, the petitioners might have caused some injury on the person of the informant's side in which Pawan Kumar, son of the informant received grievous injury, which is attributable to petitioner no.2 Subhash Yadav. Allegation against other petitioners is general and omnibus. Petitioners have clean antecedent. On these grounds, learned counsel seeks that the petitioners be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Mr. Arvind Kumar Shrivastava, learned counsel tendered his appearance on behalf of the informant and vehemently opposed the bail application submitting that with a common intention, the petitioners have assaulted the informant, his son and other family members.

6. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners.

7. Having considered the rival submissions made on



behalf of the parties, as well as, having perused the allegation made in the F.I.R., I find that in absence of specific allegation against petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4, they are directed to be released on pre-arrest bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ACJM-I, Supaul in connection with Triveniganj P.S. Case No. 345 of 2024, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C / 482(2) BNSS.

8. Considering the grievous injury sustained on the person of Pawan Kumar, son of the informant and the injury is attributable to the petitioner no.2 Subhash Yadav, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner no.2 Subhash Yadav on pre-arrest bail.

9. The petitioner no.2, if so advised, may surrender and seek regular bail. The learned District Court may consider that the petitioner no.2 in his self defence may have caused some injury and the case and counter case arises out of the same incidence.

10. The District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4 and if it is



found that the petitioner nos. 1, 3 and 4 are involved in some other cases as what has been stated in Para-3 of the bail petition, this order will automatically lose its force.

11. The bail application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

mantreshwar/-

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

