

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87529 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2024 Thana- SIMRI District- Darbhanga

Chandan Kumar Yadav @ Chandan Yadav @ Chandan Kumar S/o- Yaduvir
Yadav @ Yaduveer Yadav R/o - Mahamadpur, P.S - Bishanpur, District -
Darbhanga, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Indihar Kumari, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 06-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Simri
P.S. Case No. 120 of 2024 instituted for the offences under
Section 394 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, three unknown
miscreants fired bullet upon the informant and looted his bag
containing some documents, ATM Card and his mobile phone.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that
the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.
Petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The name of the petitioner
transpired in this case on the basis of confessional statement of



the co-accused Mahesh Yadav. No incriminating article has been recovered from this petitioner. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 20.09.2024 and has four criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that co-accused Mahesh Yadav in his confessional statement has disclosed that this petitioner has fired bullet upon the informant which is corroborated by the injury report and thereafter, the accused persons looted him, therefore, the involvement of the petitioner cannot be discarded in the alleged occurrence.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and as per the material available on the case diary there is specific allegation of firing attributed to this petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

9. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew the prayer for grant of bail before the Trial Court if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from today.



If any such application is filed, the learned Trial Court shall consider the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

