

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1673 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-239 Year-2024 Thana- CHHATAPUR District- Supaul

Kameshwar Yadav @ Kameswar Yadav @ Kamesar Yadav Son of Puran
Yadav R/o Village- Datua P.S- Jadiya District-Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sunil Pathak, Advocate
		Mr. Madhav Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Aatur Rahman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 04-04-2025 Heard Mr. Sunil Pathak, learned counsel for the petitioner
and Mr. Madhav Jha, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in a case registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 329(4),
126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 109(1), 127(2), 103(1), 305(a) of
BNSS and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along
with 21 other persons being armed with weapon were assaulting
Pramod Yadav. It is further alleged that Ramesh Yadav and
Kameshwar Yadav fired at Pramod Yadav which hit in his left
hand. Ram Kumar Yadav, the brother-in-law of Pramod Yadav
came to rescue then Arvind Yadav fired at the temple of Ram
Kumar Yadav who fell down and later on died. It is further alleged
that all the accused persons entered in the house of Pramod Yadav



and took away valuables worth two lakh rupees.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. It is also submitted that the only allegation this petitioner and one another person is that both fired upon one Pramod Yadav who sustained injury on his left leg. The specific allegation is against Mukesh Yadav and Arvind Yadav who fired upon his temple, due to which, he died. As per FIR, it transpires that there was land dispute between both the parties. Similarly situated other co-accused person namely, Chhotu Yadav @ Ranjit Kumar has been granted bail by this Court in Cr. Misc. Case No. 83767 of 2024. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 14.08.2024.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The above named petitioners are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each of them with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Supaul in connection with Chhatapur P.S. Case No. 239 of 2024.



7. Accordingly, the present bail application stands
allowed.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

U			
---	--	--	--

