

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13299 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-216 Year-2023 Thana- BAHADURPUR District- Darbhanga

Chandhash Yadav Son of Sri Gartu Yadav Resident of village - Taralahi,
P.S.- Bahadurpur, District - Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:	Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, Sr. Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. This is the third attempt of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Bahadurpur P.S. Case No. 216 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the has been rejected twice vide orders dated 03.01.2024 and 22.11.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 65063/2023 and Cr. Misc. No. 61422/2024 respectively which reads as under:-

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Bahadurpur P.S. Case No. 216 of 2023 registered for the offence under Sections 302, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The following order was passed on 03.01.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 65063 of 2023 by a co-



ordinate Bench:-

“Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Bahadurpur P.S. Case No. 216 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 302, 307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, the petitioner along with three co-accused persons are said to have shot dead the cousin of the informant. The informant also sustained injury in the said incident.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. He has falsely been implicated in this case. According to the prosecution case, co-accused Garthu Yadav firstly fired upon the head of the deceased by his pistol due to which he died. It is also submitted that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 23.5.2023.

5. Learned APP appearing for the state and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR who also along with co-accused Abhinash Yadav, Abhinandan Yadav and Garthu Yadav has specifically been alleged to fire upon the deceased Ravi Singh due to which he died. Postmortem report corroborates the prosecution case in which seven entry & seven exit wound have been mentioned which were caused by firearm. It is also submitted that the witnesses of this case have supported the prosecution version.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of allegation, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. The trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as soon as possible. ”

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 23.05.2023 and therefore he deserves bail.

5. The learned senior counsel for the informant; Shri Krishna Pd. Singh and the learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer of the



petitioner and have submitted that the informant is ready to cooperate in the trial but because of the delaying tactics of the petitioner, the trial could not commence.

6. The learned senior counsel for the informant has further submitted that after rejection on 03.01.2024 in Cr. Misc. No. 65063 of 2023, a discharge application was filed in the Trial Court on behalf of the petitioner which has been dismissed recently and therefore, the trial could not commence. He further submits that the prosecution will cooperate in the trial and will produce the witnesses on the date fixed.

7. Considering the direct allegation against the petitioner and the fact that seven gun shot injuries have been found on the deceased, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, therefore, this application for bail is dismissed.

8. The Court below is directed to expedite the trial. If the trial is delayed by the prosecution, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the trial is delayed, therefore, the petitioner may be granted bail.

5. Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, learned Senior Counsel for the informant submits that it is the petitioner who is delaying the trial by filing two discharge applications.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court finds no ground to review its earlier order.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed again.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

tusharika/-

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

