

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22731 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-389 Year-2025 Thana- RAJPUR District- Buxar

Shivshankar Singh @ Shree Singh @ Shree Yadav @ Shivshankar Yadav S/O
Late Mahar Singh @ Manohar Singh R/o Vill.- Ahiyapur, P.s- Rajpur, Dist-
Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Priya Ranjan, Advocate Mr. Abhishek Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Jai Prakash Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2026 Heard Mr. Priya Ranjan, learned counsel for the
petitioner, Mr. Jai Prakash Singh, learned counsel for the
informant and Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
15.12.2025 in connection with Rajpur P.S. Case No. 389 of
2025, F.I.R. dated 15.12.2025 for the offences punishable under
Sections 103(1), 61(2), 109 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. According to prosecution case, all the accused
persons including this petitioner were running towards the
informant and his relative and co-accused, Ajit Yadav and Sonu



Yadav fired upon informant's relative due to which he died. Thereafter, all the accused persons started firing upon them and fled from the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. He further submits that due to Rajpur P.S. Case No. 180 of 2025 which was filed against the informant and other accused persons, the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that although petitioner is named in the FIR but from perusal of the FIR it appears that the specific allegation of firing is against the co-accused, namely, Ajit Yadav and Sonu Yadav and there is no specific allegation of assault or firing against the petitioner. He further submits that the police after investigation submitted the charge sheet against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 15.12.2025.

5. The learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the present crime in



question but from perusal of the FIR it appears that the specific allegation is against the co-accused, namely, Ajit Yadav and Sonu Yadav.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, 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 the learned CJM, Buxar in connection with Rajpur P.S. Case No. 389 of 2025, subject to 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 absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his 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)

Vanisha/-

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

