

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44047 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-284 Year-2025 Thana- MANIHARI District- Katihar

=====

Kumod Kumar Yadav @ Jagga @ Jagga Yadav @ Kumod Yadav S/O Yamuna
Yadav @ Jabun Yadav R/O Nawabganj, PS- Manihari, Distt- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-07-2026 Heard Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
29.03.2026 in connection with Manihari P.S. Case No. 284 of
2025, F.I.R. dated 16.11.2025 for the offences punishable under
Sections 191(2) & (3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109 and
351(2) & (3) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. According to prosecution case, all the accused
persons including this petitioner have assaulted the informant
and his uncle and aunt over a land dispute where this petitioner
opened fire upon the informant due to which he got injured.

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. It appears from the FIR that due to admitted land dispute the present occurrence has taken place. There is case and counter case between the parties. As per the allegation in the FIR, the petitioner has shot fire upon the informant due to which he received injury but the injury report of the informant suggest that the injury is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt object and the same does not support the allegation as alleged in the FIR. He further submits that the police after investigation submitted the charge sheet against the petitioner. He further submits that similarly situated, co-accused, namely, Jabun Yadav @ Yamuna Yadav and others have been granted anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.05.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 32719 of 2026. The petitioner is in custody since 29.03.2026.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner has clean antecedent, injury report of the informant does not support the allegation as alleged in the FIR



and similarly situated co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, 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, Katihar in connection with Manihari P.S. Case No. 284 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	
---	--	---	--

