

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65325 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-596 Year-2025 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Vikash Yadav Son of Chunnu Yadav, Resident of Village- Uchla Sadak Tola,
PS- Barari, Dist- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Vikash Yadav, Advocate Mr.Aditya Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms.Renuka Ratnakar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 17-09-2025 Heard Mr. Vikash Yadav along with Mr. Aditya Singh, learned counsels appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Ms. Renuka Ratnakar, learned APP for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in connection with Katihar Town P.S.Case No.596 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(1), 61(2) and 3(5) of BNS.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, one Sonu Nigam Kumar was apprehended on the spot, who was appearing in the selection process of the Home guard in place of the petitioner (Vikash Yadav).

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely



implicated in the present case, however, the direct allegation is against one Sonu Kumar Nigam, who was apprehended on the spot. He is on regular bail, vide order dated 08.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.61764 of 2025. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner was even not apprehended nor he was found in any manner connected with the alleged offence.

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

6. From perusal of the impugned order, it appears that the allegation against the petitioner is that by forging the document along with another co-accused, namely, Sonu Kumar Nigam, he got selected in the Home guard recruitment by placing Sonu Kumar Nigam to take the examination, who was apprehended on the spot.

7. Considering the nature of allegation made against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on pre-arrest bail.

8. However, the petitioner, if so advised, may surrender before the learned district court and seek regular bail and the learned District Court may consider the bail application of the petitioner on the same day and pass a reasoned order in accordance with law.



9. With the above observation/direction, the present
bail application stands disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

chn/-

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

