

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86562 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-29 Year-2017 Thana- LAXMIPUR District- Jamui

=====

Dinesh Yadav S/O Punna Yadav R/O Vill.- Karra, P.S.-LAXMIPUR, Dist.-
JAMUI

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jharkhandi Upadhyay

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 05-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Laxmipur P.S. Case No. 29/2017 corresponding to Sessions Trial No. 396/2024 dated 29.03.2017 registered for the offence punishable u/ss 147, 148, 149, 307, 120B and 302 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of the Explosive Substance Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on 09.03.2017, when the informant was drinking tea with his friend Bablu Kumar Paswan and his villager Janaki Yadav in front of Dinesh Yadav's tea shop, in the meantime, the co-accused Jaggu Yadav came from his house with a bomb in his hand and threw it on him due



to which his forehead, ear, hand and whole body got injured in the bomb explosion. Thereafter, Rajesh Yadav and Dinesh Yadav (the petitioner) came on a motorcycle from Jhajha and his villagers Sanjay Yadav and Pintu Yadav came on another motorcycle and Rajesh Yadav stopped and threw a bomb on the informant due to which he got injured and started running here and there to save his life. Further, Dinesh Yadav and Pintu Yadav threw a bomb on Bablu Kumar Paswan, due to which he fell on the ground in an injured condition. Meanwhile, Suresh Yadav and Ghogho Yadav came on another motorcycle and Ghogho Yadav threw a bomb on him but the bomb did not hit him. Suresh Yadav tried to catch him, but he ran away. Janaki Yadav was also injured in the bomb explosion. The reason for the incident is that Jaggu Yadav and his group used to demand commission from his younger brother for driving a magic car, which they used to oppose.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel has submitted that including the informant total three witnesses have been examined and the informant has denied the involvement of the petitioner in the



crime alleged. The petitioner has two antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is in custody since 15.12.2023.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner.

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, Jamui in connection with Laxmipur P.S. Case No. 29/2017 corresponding to Sessions Trial No. 396/2024, 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 bond of the petitioner is liable to be cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

