

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83137 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-367 Year-2023 Thana- BARH District- Patna

=====

Bano Yadav @ Bana Yadav @ Dharmendra Yadav S/o Ram Pravesh Yadav
R/o Village - Sakshohra, P.S - Sakshohra, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 03-12-2025 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Barh P.S. Case No. 367 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Section 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is of causing firing upon the informant. However, it is specifically alleged that the same did not hit to the informant. It is further alleged that when the informant was trying to flee from the place of occurrence, the petitioner along with three persons chased him and resorted to fire. However, the bullet did not hit. In the meanwhile, on account of the firing being made a minor boy has sustained bullet injury. The reason behind such occurrence is



said to be a demand of interest over the borrowed amount.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that admittedly the informant has not sustained any injury, moreover, the boy who has allegedly sustained a bullet injury, no FIR has been instituted on his behalf. It is further contended that the reason for the said occurrence clearly shows that there was a money dispute pending between the parties and, as such, the false implication of the petitioner cannot be ruled out. However, only on account of the fact that the petitioner has four criminal antecedent and, as such, his prayer for bail has been denied.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State opposed the pre-arrest bail application and submits that the informant was fortunate enough that the bullet did not hit him, otherwise he would have suffered a fatal injury.

6. Having considered the submissions set-forth by learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, who is facing four other criminal case, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders within a period of four weeks, from today, his prayer for bail shall be considered without being prejudice by the order of this Court



and taking note of the fact that on account of the firing made by the petitioner, none has sustained any injury besides the other submissions, the bail application stands rejected.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

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

