IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67443 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010831202026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-25 Year-2006 Thana- SHEIKHOPUR SARAI District- Sheikhpura

==========

Shravan Yadav @ Sharvan Kumar @ Sharvan Yadav S/O Brahamdeo Yadav R/O Village- Bhadeli, P.S. and District- Sheikhpura

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Govind, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

2 06-11-2026 Heard Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Bharat Bhushan representing the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sheikhopur Sarai P.S. Case No. 25 of 2006 for the offence registered under sections 147, 148, 149, 302, 120B of IPC and 27 of Arms Act lodged on 23.09.2006 by the informant,Ramdeo Prasad.

3. As per the prosecution story, the matter is of the year 2006, the informant alleged that he had gone for treatment of some patient at Bahikatta and in the process, has moved to Mushartoli. He saw his younger brother, Narendra Kumar returning and when he reached near a partly constructed house, the accused persons

WEB COPY

resorted to indiscriminate firing on the order of Brahamdeo Yadav. It hit him, he was found lying in the paddy field who later died, which followed the FIR.

4. The matter is of the year 2006, cognizance has been taken in the year 2009, 19 years later, Cr. Misc. No. 12300 of 2025 was preferred which was rejected on 13.05.2025 and paragraph 5 to 7 read as under:

> *5. Learned APP, Mr. Bharat Bhushan opposes the prayer submitting that the matter is of the year 2016, even taking into account his ignorance, he filed anticipatory bail in the year 2021 before the learned Sessions Judge, Sheikhpura which came to be rejected on 05.04.2021. Still, he took four years to come before this Court.*
>
> *6. Taking into account the aforesaid facts including that the case has been lodged under Section 302 of the IPC in which the petitioner is one of the named accused, it would be appropriate that he seek bail.*
>
> *7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.*

5. Once again, the anticipatory bail application by the

WEB COPY

petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequently, trial took place and 12 of the 14 accused have been acquitted and in that background, the present second anticipatory bail application has been filed.

7. Mr. Bharat Bhushan opposes the prayer and reiterate what has been recorded in paragraph 5 of the earlier anticipatory bail order.

8. Taking into account the fact that the present anticipatory bail application has been preferred 20 years after the occurrence which under the Sections which include Section 302 of the IPC, earlier, the relief was denied, as recorded above, in that background, there is no need to give a re-look to it.

9. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY