

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2167 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-26 Year-2025 Thana- HARINMAR District- Munger

=====

Sujeet Yadav Son of Om Yadav Resident of Village- Goraiya Bathan, P.S.-
Gogari Jamalpur, District- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Indu Bhushan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 21-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Harinmar P.S. Case No. 26 of 2025 instituted for the offence
under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109, 303(2), 115(2), 352 &
351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on
30.06.2025, while the informant's minor son was ploughing his
field with tractor, the accused persons, armed with firearms,
forcibly stopped him, abused and assaulted him and on the order
of co-accused, namely, Kshatri Yadav, co-accused, Vikash
Yadav fired a pistol causing firearm injury to the victim's leg. It
is also alleged that during the assault, cash of Rs. 3,500/- and a



gold chain were also snatched.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 18.11.2025. Petitioner bears two criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. From perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner, rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that even if the allegation is taken on its face value, petitioner was at best the member of the mob. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. There is subsisting land dispute between the parties.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, period of custody of the petitioner, there being no specific allegation against the petitioner and manner of petitioner's implication, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing



bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Fifteen Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Harinmar P.S. Case No. 26 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be own/close member of the family of the petitioner.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed at the trial. In case of default in such appearance on two consecutive dates, the Trial Court will have liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

