

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18605 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2025 Thana- GOGRI District- Khagaria

=====

Aashish Yadav @ Aashish Kumar S/O Pankaj Yadav @ Subodh Yadav
Resident of Village- Tofir Tola, K.D. College Road, P.S.- Gogri, District-
Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Jha, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109,
303(2), 329(4), 352 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023 read with
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of seven cases and is in the custody
17.12.2025 and the informant alleges that on 25.07.2025 in



between 9-10:30 PM, he was at his rice mill when 8 accused persons including petitioner came and started assaulting his truck driver Sikandar, when informant tried to save him, the accused persons vandalized three vehicles and assaulted Sikandar brutally and Dharmendra looted Rs. two lakhs, while petitioner snatched his chain, it is next alleged that the informant tried calling 112, but there was no response, but somehow the informant managed to reach the police station when accused persons again came and started firing with an intent to create terror, in the firing Manoj @ Aryan suffered firearm injury on his right thigh, further police came when accused fled leaving motorcycle number BR-51-K-2242, further reason for the occurrence is Dharmendra was honking for pass, but the road was narrow hence his truck driver Sikandar could not give pass, which enraged Dharmendar and the occurrence was committed.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of that allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that thrust of the allegation is against Dharmendra and petitioner is alleged to have snatched the chain of the informant.



It is also submitted that even allegation of firing is alleged, but then the same is not specific.

5. The Learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the regular bail application of the petitioner and submits petitioner has antecedent of seven serious cases, but then fairly submits that in the FIR, it is alleged that petitioner snatched the chain of the informant, but thereafter draws the attention of the Court to the order impugned to submit that the same records that at Para 76 of the case diary, it has come that petitioner was also involved in firing, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that petitioner was known to the informant and if petitioner had fired in that event, the informant would have specifically named him in the FIR that it was petitioner who fired, but since he carries antecedent of 7 cases, as such, during the course of investigation he was roped with the said allegation also.

6. At this stage, the learned APP for the State submits that if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.



8. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

9. **Accordingly, the instant regular bail application stands rejected.**

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

