

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42517 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2025 Thana- KHIJARSARAI District- Gaya

Ranjeet Kumar @ Ramtahal Yadav S/o Sri Rajnandan Yadav R/o Village -
Vishnu Bagicha, Panihar, P.S - Khudaganj, District - Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The state of Bihar and Anr Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satya Veer, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Nityanand, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 09-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Khizarsarai P.S. Case No. 12 of 2025 registered for the offence
under Section 309(4) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner was
rejected on 04.09.2025. The order reads as follows:-

*“Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.*

*2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in
connection with Khizarsarai P.S. Case No. 12 of 2025
registered for the offence under Section 309(4) of the
BNS.*



3. *As per the prosecution case, unknown accused persons are alleged to have looted Bolero vehicle and Rs. 4500/- from the informant.*

4. *The petitioner is in custody since 12.2.2025.*

5. *The name of the petitioner has come in the self inculpatory statement of the co-accused and the petitioner is accused in eleven more serious cases.*

6. *Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.”*

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that out of three witnesses only one witness has been examined. The petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for regular bail of the petitioner on the ground of delay in the trial.

6. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and the fact that the petitioner has eleven criminal antecedents and that the trial has already commenced, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

8. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made



herein are limited to the adjudication of the present bail application and shall not prejudice the case of the petitioner at any subsequent stage of the trial and this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

shalini/-

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

