

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16928 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2025 Thana- SAHEBPUR KAMAL District-
Begusarai

=====

Lalu Yadav @ Abhinash Kumar S/o Late Pramodi Yadav R/o Village-
Raghunathpur, Ward No.02, P.S- Sahebpur Kamal, Dist- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nagendra Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Sahebpur Kamal P.S. Case No. 183 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 351(1),
351(2), 352, 109(1) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 read with
Section 27 of the Arms Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody
since 05.12.2025 and the informant alleges that she had gone to
the house of petitioner on 20.06.2025 at 06:30 PM for seeking
her money amounting to Rs. 70,000/- which she had given to
the petitioner by way of loan, but petitioner refused to repay the



loan amount, further on the same day, the petitioner along with named accused persons came at 08:00 PM and petitioner fired causing firearm injury on her leg.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that father of the petitioner was killed in the year 2016 for which Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016 was instituted by the petitioner against the husband of the informant, as husband of the informant was the assailant of the father of the petitioner. It is further submitted that it absolutely defies all logic, wisdom and reasonable human behaviour that the informant, being wife of an accused who is involved in killing of the father of the petitioner, would have given loan to the petitioner of Rs. 70,000/-. It is next submitted that trial in Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016 has commenced and evidence is going on, as such, the instant false case came to be instituted with an intent to coerce the petitioner into submission, so that he does not give evidence in the trial arising out of Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016. It is next submitted that petitioner was not even aware of his implication in the instant case, as such after institution of the instant case, his evidence was recorded in the trial arising out of Salkuha P.S. Case No.



236 of 2016. It is submitted that had the petitioner been aware of his implication in the instant case then he would not have been in a position to get his evidence recorded in the said case.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is a specific allegation against the petitioner of causing firearm injury to the informant. It is further submitted that though it has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner was not aware of his implication in the instant case, as such, he got his evidence recorded in the trial arising out of Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016, after institution of the instant case, but then the same is not substantiated by any documentary evidence that petitioner after institution of the instant FIR, got his statement/evidence recorded in the trial arising out of Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner above-named, is directed to be released on **provisional bail** on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Sahebpur Kamal



P.S. Case No. 183 of 2025.

7. It is made clear that thereafter the learned Trial Court shall verify whether the evidence of the petitioner in the trial arising out of Salkuha P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016 dated 15.12.2016 was recorded after 21.06.2025 or not, if it is found that evidence of the petitioner was recorded in the aforesaid trial after 21.06.2025, in that event the provisional bail bonds of the petitioner shall be confirmed, but if it is found that evidence of the petitioner was recorded in the aforesaid trial prior to 21.06.2025, in that event the provisional bail bonds shall be cancelled forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

