

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20904 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2025 Thana- AMARPUR District- Banka

=====

Brajesh Yadav @ Brajesh Kumar Yadav Son of Sachitanand Yadav @
Sachidanand Yadav Resident of Village- Barmasiya (Badi Jankipur), P.S.-
Amarpur, District- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajay Mukherjee

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Rina Sinha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Amarpur PS Case No.
10 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 310(4), 310(5), 132, 109(1) and 111 of the Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 27 and 35 of Arms
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of three cases and was arrested on 17-
12-2025 and the informant alleges that based on information,
the house of Jayant Yadav was raided from where Shiv Shakti
Yadav and Pankaj Kumar were arrested and from their
possession, arms and live cartridges along with a fired cartridge



were discovered as detailed in the FIR and the apprehended accused in their confessional statement disclosed the name of Gaurav Chaudhary, petitioner and others, who fled from the place of occurrence, when police arrived.

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 petitioner was not arrested from the spot and his name transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended-accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond .

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner had earlier moved before this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc No. 24499 of 2025 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 2-5-2025, but then in Cr. Misc No. 24499 of 2025, the petitioner had pleaded that he has antecedent of one case when in the instant regular bail application, it is pleaded that petitioner has antecedent of three cases, which amply demonstrates that petitioner on earlier occasion had not approached the Court with clean hand. It is also submitted that if



privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

