

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56300 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-209 Year-2024 Thana- SHANKARPUR District- Madhepura

Jay Kumar Yadav, aged about 58 years, male, Son of Late Satyanarayan Yadav Resident of village - Gopalpur, Belha, P.S.- Kumarkhand (Bhatni O.P.), District - Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND MALVIYA

ORAL ORDER

3 17-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner is in custody in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2) 115(2), 109, 303(2), 308(4), 308(5), 351(2),(3), 352, 3(5) of the BNS and Sections (2). (3). 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, informant being Munshi in construction work of 720 S.T.S.C. Residential School Machha, and the allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other co-accused persons armed with deadly weapons came at the construction premises of said Residential School and started abusing the informant and demanded ransom. There is further allegation that they looted the huge quantity of



construction materials such as sand, *gitti*, cement, grill, plank, electric wire, tiles etc at the gunpoint and when the informant opposed them, they bullet fired on him but luckily it hit at the door, wall/grill.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He next submits that in the alleged FIR the informant has not mentioned about extortion amount which was demanded by the accused persons. He further submits that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He submits that petitioner is in custody since 19.05.2025 and has got fifteen criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail petition out of which in seven cases he has been acquitted and in rest cases he is on bail.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the First Information Report, case diary along and impugned order dated 23.07.2025, it appears that the witnesses have supported the version of the FIR and from perusal of the case diary it appears that part of fired cartridges have been recovered from the place of occurrence and it also appears that petitioner has fifteen criminal antecedents



and some of them are registered for the same nature of offence of the present case. So, considering all facts and circumstances of the case submission of learned counsel of both the parties, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

8. However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after completion of one year of his judicial remand.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Harshita/-

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

