IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66313 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010946992026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-342 Year-2020 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

==========

Mukesh Yadav son of Balmukund Yadav Resident of village- Chilkakhar, Ps- Charkapathar Dist- Jamui

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Brajesh Sahay, Advocate
	:	Miss Rishika Arya, Advocate
	:	Miss adya Dipti, Advocate
	:	Miss Mandavi Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Mohammad Sufyan, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 30-10-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Sono (Charkapathar) PS Case No. 342 of 2020, instituted for the offence under Sections 147, 149, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, Sections 3/4 of Explosive Substance Act, Sections 18, 21 of N.D.P.S. Act and Sections 16,17,18,19,20,21,22 of U.A.P. Act

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that following the arrest and confession of the co-accused Lakhan Yadav, the police team conducted a raid in Asarkho forest area. It is

WEB COPY

alleged that during search, police recovered approx. 10 kg of Ammonium Nitrate. It is further alleged that co-accused Lakhan Yadav revealed that petitioner Mukesh Yadav and his associates were involved in attacking police personnel and collecting levy/ extortion money.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is languishing in custody since 29.12.2025 and charges have been framed. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner's name has been added on confession statement of co-accused on the basis of suspicion. Learned counsel also submits that because of the criminal history of the petitioner, he has falsely been implicated in this case.

5. The learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Having heard the parties and taking into consideration the fact that charges have been framed and co-accused persons have been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court and also considering the fact that criminal antecedents, by themselves, cannot constitute a sole ground for rejection of bail, as held by the Hon'ble

WEB COPY

Apex Court in the case of ***Abhimanue Etc. Etc. v. State of Kerala*** and also the fact that the name of the petitioner has been added merely on suspicion, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the abovenamed petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional District & Sessions Judge-III, Jamui in connection with Sono (Charkapathar) PS Case No. 342 of 2020, subject to the following conditions :-

(I) One of the bailors shall be the petitioner's own or close family member.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed during the trial and also co-operate in the process of trial.

(III) The petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence/ intimidate any witness during the course of trial.

(IV) The petitioner shall not commit offence of a similar nature in future.

WEB COPY

In case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Alok Kumar, J)

rinkee/-

U		T	

WEB COPY