

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30499 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2026 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

Jitendra Yadav @ Jitendra Kumar S/O Sadhu Yadav @ Sadhu Saran Village-
Salempur, P.s.- Mufassil, District -Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Durgesh Nandan, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

informant.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 85 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 324(5) and 326(g) of B.N.S.

3. As per the allegation, the informant received information during the night that his shop has caught fire. Upon receiving the information, a call was made to Dial 112, following which the fire was extinguished with the assistance of the district administration. It is further alleged that, on the basis of the CCTV footage, the district administration identified the petitioner as the person who had come from his house to the



shop and ignited the fire. It is also alleged that goods and articles worth Rs. 13,65,000/- were burnt into ashes.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there exists a dispute between the petitioner and the informant, who happens to be the petitioner's tenant. It has further been submitted that from the bare perusal of the case diary, it is apparent that while CCTV footage was looked into but no hard disk came to be seized. It has also been submitted that petitioner has been made accused in one another case, but not of similar nature and he is on bail. Lastly, it has been submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 24.01.2026 and chargesheet has been submitted in this case and there is no allegation of tampering against the petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that petitioner was identified in the CCTV footage, to be the person who had ignited the fire. It has further been submitted that articles worth Rs. 13,65,000/- has been destroyed and there are sufficient material against the petitioner.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.



7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the period of custody, let the above named petitioner 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, Gaya, in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 85 of 2026.

8. The application stands allowed.

9. The petitioner is directed to physically appear on each and every date in trial and failure to appear on two consecutive dates without any reasonable ground, the Court below shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

10. It is further directed that the petitioner will not tamper with the evidence and if he is found doing so, the prosecution would be at liberty to file appropriate application for cancellation of his bail bonds.

11. One of the bailors shall be close relative of the petitioner.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

Ankit Kumar/-

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

