

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76726 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2024 Thana- NAURANGIA District- West Champaran

Vijay Yadav @ Vijai son of Mangru Yadav @ Magaru village-Bodhichapar,  
Ps- Hanumanganj, dist- Kushinagar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                           |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr.Umesh Kumar Gupta      |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Ramendra Kumar Bharti |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr.Ram Sevak Choudhary    |

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

ORAL ORDER

3      10-01-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and  
  
learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P  
  
for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Naurangiya P.S. Case No. 47 of 2024 dated 15.06.2024 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 302, 201 read with section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant's father went to graze his cattle but did not return, thereafter his dead body was found in a *Nala*. It is further submitted that earlier the petitioner and the co-accused person



threatened his father to kill within a period of six months.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to previous enmity. It is further submitted that the informant did not file any report before police regarding missing of his father. There is no eyewitness to the alleged occurrence. The dead body of his father was recovered from the Nala and the petitioner was implicated only on the basis of mere suspicion. There is no specific allegation and overt act against the petitioner. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 16.08.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant as well as learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that earlier the petitioner threatened to kill the informant's father. It is further submitted that as per para 85 of the case diary, there is direct allegation against the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the specific and



heinous nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail petition of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

