

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6176 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-284 Year-2016 Thana- NOORSARAI District- Nalanda

=====

Pappu Kumar @ Pappu Yadav Son of Damodar Yadav @ Damodar Singh
Resident of Village - Mahmoodpur, Balwal, P.S.- Kalyanbigha, District -
Nalanda (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anirudh Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY

ORAL ORDER

2 04-02-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Noorsarai P.S. Case no.284 of 2016 registered under section 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the accused persons are said to have come variously armed and of having shot Mukhiyaji leading to his death.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. He was falsely implicated in the case in course of investigation. Referring to the material that has transpired in course of investigation as has been mentioned in the order of the learned Court below, it is submitted that the only material against the petitioner is that after the accused persons had given effect to the occurrence, the petitioner had



assisted them by feeding them at his place of residence. It is submitted that no overt act has been alleged against this petitioner who could not move the Court for bail on earlier occasion as he was not aware about the pendency of the case. The petitioner is in custody since 18.10.2025 and undertakes to abide by any condition which may be laid by this Court for his release on bail.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State who submits that in a case registered in November, 2016, the petitioner could be taken into custody only in October, 2025 after having absconded for nearly nine years.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations in the FIR, the material that has transpired in course of investigation and in view of the fact that the petitioner absconded for almost 9 years till he was taken into custody on 18.10.2025, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months or on framing of charge, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

