

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38142 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2025 Thana- Bahoranpur District- Bhojpur

Dinesh Yadav @ Dinesh Kumar Yadav S/O Sri Raja Ram Yadav @ Ram Ram
Yadav R/O Village- Karja, P.S - Bahoranpur, District- Bhojpur at Ara.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Aditya Narayan Singh.1
Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 5 29-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in Bahoranpur P. S. Case
No.18 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 109(1), 352, 351(1) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. and Section
27 of the Arms Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that on orders of Birendra and Rajaram, the
petitioner fired causing firearm injury to the informant on his
abdomen and his uncle also received firearm injury on his right
hand as they were trying to settle the dispute in between the



petitioner and the wife of Kaushal.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the manner in which the FIR has been instituted casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is submitted that date of occurrence is 29.01.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on the written information given by the informant to the police on 30.01.2025. It is next submitted that had the informant and his uncle be treated in a hospital, in that event, the hospital would have informed the police that the victim of firearm injury have been admitted for treatment and the fard-bayan would have been recorded at the hospital, but then, the same was not done, as such, it has been submitted that this aspect of the matter casts aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that petitioner surrendered before the learned District Court on 01.02.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application. It is submitted that there is specific allegation against this petitioner of causing firearm injury to the informant and his uncle.

6. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that since the informant on the



next day of the occurrence had approached the police station for instituting an FIR that amply demonstrates that either the occurrence as alleged was never committed or even if committed, the injury was simple or else the hospital would not have discharged the informant.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

8. The prayer of the petitioner for bail stands rejected.

9. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

