

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1482 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-253 Year-2024 Thana- BAIRIYA District- West Champaran

Mukesh Yadav S/o Hari Shankar Yadav R/o Vill- Bargachniya, P.S.- Bairiya,
Distt.- West Champaran, Bettiah Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Mishra, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Ballabh Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

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

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Bairiya P.S. Case No. 253 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 3(5) of the B.N.S. 2023 and under Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned Counsel submits that the petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that on 27.07.2024 at about 07:00 PM, one Chandan Mahto called the informant's son on his mobile, thereafter all the accused persons including the petitioner came at his door on three motorcycles, thereafter the son of the informant accompanied the aforesaid five accused persons and while going the son of the informant said that he would return in half an hour, but his son did not return in the night and next day in the morning the dead body of the son of the informant was found lying in a field.

4. The learned Counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case by the informant. It is further submitted that the deceased was involved in case relating to liquor and it might be a possibility that he was killed by his rival gang and the petitioner and other accused persons came to be implicated in this case.

5. The learned APP for the State opposes the bail application of the petitioner and submits that the father of the deceased has instituted the present FIR and it does not appear probable that the father would falsely implicate someone who was not involved in taking away of the deceased in the night. It is also submitted that the petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the investigation is going on, as such, if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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