

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48385 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-311 Year-2024 Thana- JHAJHA District- Jamui

Kapildeo Yadav @ Suraj Yadav @ Pappu Yadav @ Kapil Yadav S/o
Chintamani Yadav @ Chintaman Yadav R/o Vill- Ahyara, P.S.- Bharoganj,
Distt- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 03-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Session Trial No. 09 of 2025, arising out of Jhajha P.S. Case No.
311 of 2024 instituted for the offences under Sections 140(2),
126(2), 115(2), 109, 127(2) & 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya
Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per prosecution case, the accusation against the
accused persons including the petitioner is of taking away the
Informant and his associate along with their Thar vehicle to the
forest and demanded Rs. fifty lacs from them as ransom.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged



against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious/physical possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 26.07.2024 without any rhymes or reason. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the co-accused Dipak Thakur @ Dipal Kumar has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 82419 of 2024.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature. He submits that the petitioner was arrested from the house of the co-accused Sudhir Paswan along with other co-accused persons. The petitioner has also confessed his guilt in his confessional statement wherein he has also disclosed the name of the other co-accused of being involved in the alleged occurrence. Several other persons have also supported the prosecution case. The police has also recovered the looted articles such as driving license, Aadhaar card, ATM card, purse etc. of the victim Kumar Rahul Nehru. Learned counsel for the



State further submits that from perusal of the case diary, it appears that the victim Abhimanyu Kumar in course of T.I.P. has identified the petitioner. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and, hence, he does not deserve bail. The Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has submitted the charge-sheet under Sections 140(2), 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 127(2), 61(2), 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. Bail of other co-accused has been rejected by this Court vide order dated 25-03-2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 90039 of 2024.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the entire facts and circumstances of the case as also considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is ***rejected*** with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

