

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18546 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-106 Year-2025 Thana- Bathnaha District- Araria

Manish Yadav @ Manish Kumar Son of Late Lilanand Yadav Resident of
Village- Palasi Ward No. 06, P.S.- Narpatganj, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate
	:	Mr.Purushottam Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Md. Fahimuddin,APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-03-2026 Heard Mr.Ajay Kumar Thakur, learned counsel for
the petitioner, learned counsel for the informant and Mr.Md.
Fahimuddin, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, who is in custody since
21.12.2025 in connection with Bathnaha P.S. Case No. 106 of
2025, F.I.R. dated 28.10.2025 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 118(1), 117(2), 109,
61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Allegation against the petitioner is that he caught
hold the informant and co-accused person, namely, Ganesh
Yadav fired upon the informant on his left waist as a result of
which he became badly injured.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
submits that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and



fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and even no independent witness has supported the case of the prosecution. Although the petitioner is not named in the FIR but it appears from the FIR that there is no specific allegation of any assault, overt-act or firing attributed against the petitioner rather the allegation against the petitioner is that he caught hold to the informant and the co-accused person, namely, Ganesh Yadav has fired upon him and the police, after investigation, submitted the chargesheet against the petitioner and the petitioner is in custody since 21.12.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR and it appears from the FIR itself that he has caught hold to the informant and the co-accused person has fired upon him. Further submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one but he fairly submits that the petitioner is on bail in the said case, as mentioned in para-3 of the bail petition.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount



each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Araria in connection with Bathnaha P.S. Case No. 106 of 2025, with the following conditions:-

(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

