

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42509 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-87 Year-2025 Thana- KAKO District- Jehanabad

Rajnandan Yadav, aged about 76 years, Gender-Male, Son of Late Sadhu @
Late Sadhu Yadav, R/O Vill- Kako Tol, Pahal Bigha, P.S.- Kako, District-
Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Sameer Darshan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Parmanand Prasad, A.P.P.

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

3 11-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Kako
P.S. Case No. 87 of 2025 dated 02.04.2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 103(1), 303 of
the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 01.04.2025 in the
night, the informant and other family members slept after taking
meal. In the meantime, at about 11.00 P.M., due to previous land
dispute, some persons after entering behind the house of the



informant, started firing then the daughter and daughter-in-law came outside from their room and saw that the co-accused Sudhir Kumar, Sujit Kumar, Luv Kumar, Nitish Kumar, Gajendra Kumar, Jitendra Kumar and Raj Nandan Yadav (petitioner) were holding gun and pistol in their hands, started firing and entered the room of the house and started loot-pat and they also took Rs. 5,00,000/- cash after breaking the Godrej , kept in the room of the daughter-in-law of the informant, 11 bhar gold ornaments. When the daughter of the informant, namely, Kumari Snehlata and the daughter-in-law of the informant, namely, Sushmita Kumari @ Chameli, protested then the co-accused Sudhir, Nitish and Gajendra fired on the daughter of the informant with an intention to kill her, which hit two bullets in the right hand and one bullet hit on the right side of her chest due to which, she fell down, thereafter, the co-accused Jitendra Kumar fired on the daughter-in-law, namely, Sushmita Kumari @ Chameli of the informant with an intention to kill her which hit on the arm of her right hand, due to which, she also fell down. Thereafter the co-accused persons fled away with rupees and ornaments by firing. The family members of the informant took the injured i.e., the daughter and daughter-in-law of the informant to Sadar Hospital, Jehanabad in injured



condition from where the daughter of the informant, namely, Snehlata, was referred to P.M.C.H., Patna for treatment where she died on 02.04.2025, in course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is submitted that the petitioner is an old man aged about 76 years. There is no overt act against the petitioner. The specific allegation of firing on the daughter and the daughter-in-law of the informant is against the co-accused persons, Sudhir, Nitish, Gajendra and Jitendra. It is further submitted that there is Second Appeal No. 217 of 1997 pending between the petitioner and one Nageshwar Yadav with respect to the land dispute and during the pending of the said appeal, the informant Asha Kumari had purchased a part of the suit property from the said Nageshwar Yadav knowingly that the suit property in question is subjudiced before the Hon'ble Court. The wife of the petitioner had filed an application in the said Appeal for impleading the informant as party which has been allowed but the informant did not choose to appear in the said appeal. Hence, the informant has filed the present false case against the petitioner and his family members. It is further submitted that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.



There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. It is further submitted that other accused person, Sujeet Kumar @ Sonu Kumar has already been granted bail by a Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 44943 of 2025 vide order dated 30.07.2025. The petitioner has clean antecedent as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody in this case since 19.04.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the period of custody, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Jehanabad in connection with Kako P.S. Case No. 87 of 2025 with further conditions:-

(I) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned court below on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bonds of the petitioner are



liable to be cancelled.

II. The learned court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and at any stage, if it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the learned court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for the purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. The application stands allowed.

U.K./-

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

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

