

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17060 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2025 Thana- Darhar District- Saharsa

Pinku Yadav S/o Mahendra Yadav R/o Village - Virjain, P.S - Darhar, District
- Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Darhar P.S. Case No. 17 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(1), 115(2), 109, 74, 308(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the petitioner has fired at the mother of the informant namely, Sunita Devi.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it transpires that the dispute arose out of a trivial issue and that



the firing took place on sudden provocation. Learned counsel further submits that from perusal of the injury report of Sunita Devi, it transpires that she sustained the following injury:

(i) A lacerated wound measuring approximately 3×1 cm over the right frontal region, with active bleeding and charred surrounding skin. An NCCT scan of the brain conducted at a radiology centre on Gandhi Path, Saharsa, revealed an acute epidural bleed measuring approximately 36.2×9.4 mm in the right frontal lobe convexity, along with a depressed fracture of the right frontal bone. The injury has been opined to be caused by a firearm and is grievous in nature.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there was no intention on the part of the petitioner and there was no repetition of firing. The petitioner has been languishing in judicial custody since 20.11.2025.

6. Countering this, the application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned APP for the State and submits that from perusal of the injury report, it will transpire that the injury on the right frontal region had charred surrounding skin, meaning the firing was made from a blank range; it shows the intention of the petitioner. He also submits that the petitioner has a criminal antecedent of two cases also.



7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage, however he may renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

8. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same within the stipulated period of time.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

