

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10308 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-566 Year-2024 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Shiva Yadav Son of Jitendra Yadav @ Jitendra Roy R/o Mohalla - Teen
Gachiya, P.S. - Nagar, District - Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ankit Raj, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. This is the second attempt of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Katihar Town (Nagar) P.S. Case No. 566 of 2024 registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 109, 3(5) of B.N.S. and Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 27 and 35 of the Arms Act. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 02.07.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5017 of 2025 which reads as under:-

*Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner,
learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for
the informant.*

*2 . The petitioner seeks regular bail in
connection with Katihar Town P.S. Case No. 566 of
2024 registered for the offence under Sections 126(2),
109, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and
Sections 25(1-b)a, 26, 27 and 35 of the Arms Act.*

*3 . As per the prosecution case, the
petitioner is accused of shot having at the victim which
caused injury in his stomach.*



4 . Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He is in custody since 13.08.2024.

5 . Learned A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6 . Considering the fact that the petitioner has shot at the victim and injured him with a fire arm, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner for the present.

7 . Accordingly, this application for regular bail is hereby rejected.

3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the trial is progressing and charges have been framed.

4. Considering the gravity of offence and the fact that trial has started, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order.

5. Accordingly, this application is dismissed again.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

tusharika/-

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

