

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9922 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-76 Year-2019 Thana- ROSHANGANJ District- Gaya

-
1. Santosh Yadav son of Deoke Yadav @ Deoki Yadav Resident of Village- Barhi Bigha PS - Hunterganj Dist - Chatra Jharkhand
 2. Gopal Yadav son of Sardar Yadav Resident of Village - Barahmoriya, PS- Roshanganj, Dist- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 04-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 302 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act as well as Sections 16, 18 and 20 of the U.A.P. Act.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners had earlier moved before this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 3339 of 2024 and the same came to be rejected vide order dated 12.02.2024 by this Court. It is further submitted that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and are in custody since 09.12.2025.



4. At this stage, learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for regular bail of the petitioners and submits that the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners was rejected on 12.02.2024 and more than 20 months thereafter the petitioners were arrested on 09.12.2025. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that petitioners are member of dreaded Maoist Organization and from their house cartridges were recovered. Further, Arvind Bhuiya, Alok Yadav and 8-10 unknown accused had called the husband of the informant and fired indiscriminately killing him on the spot. Learned A.P.P. next submits that the case is under the U.A.P. Act also and since petitioners did not surrender within a reasonable time after their anticipatory bail application was rejected and came to be arrested 20 months thereafter that amply demonstrates the conduct of the petitioners. It is also submitted that if the privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioners, the petitioners may abscond.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners is not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned A.P.P. that from the house of the petitioners cartridges were recovered and it is alleged in the FIR that they belong to



Maoist Organization.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail in connection with Roshanganj P.S. Case No. 76 of 2019 pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Sherghati at Gaya/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

