

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73142 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-94 Year-2025 Thana- SINDHIYA District- Samastipur

=====

Gautam Kumar Yadav @ Gautam Kumar @ Kartoos Yadav @ Kartosh Yadav
Son of Indramani @ Indramani Yadav R/o Village - Jahangirpur, P.S. -
Singhiya, Dist. - Samstipur, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Aayush Abhishek, Advocate Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Vinay Kumar Mishra, Advocate Mrs. Usha Kumari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 16-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Sindhiya P.S. Case No. 94/2025 dated 07.06.2025 registered for the offences punishable u/s 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 308(2), 308(3), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 303(2), 109, 352, 351(2) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner called on the mobile of the informant and demanded Rs. 10 lacs saying that the informant's son is in his custody and if he want to save his life he should bring Rs. 10 lacs to the house of the petitioner.



Thereafter, the informant went to the house of the petitioner where the petitioner and the co-accused persons holding weapons were standing at the door, in the meantime, the co-accused, Indramani Yadav started abusing the informant and ordered to kill the informant and his son. Thereafter, all the accused persons started abusing and assaulting, in the meantime, the petitioner fired on the informant which passed over the head of the informant. On hearing the noise of firing, nearby villagers came and with the help of the villagers the informant rescued his son and thereafter he was taken to the hospital for treatment. Further, when the informant's son regained consciousness he told that he was returning home by taking Rs. 40,000/- from his aunt in the way, the petitioner along with Piku Yadav took him to his home and abused and assaulted him and the co-accused, Indramani snatched Rs. 40,000/-, watch and gold chain from the informant's son. The informant's has further alleged that his son sustained fracture injuries on both his hands and legs.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. There is a delay of 3 days in lodging the F.I.R. The injury no. 3 is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt object. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has three antecedent



antecedents and he is on bail in all the aforesaid cases as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 08.06.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner. It is further submitted that the injury no. 1, 2 and 4 are grievous in nature caused by hard and blunt object.

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 Court concerned, Samastipur in connection with Sindhiya P.S. Case No. 94/2025, with the condition:-

(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 is liable to be cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Atul/-

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

