

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69670 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2013 Thana- BARH District- Patna

Suli Yadav S/O Siyasharan Yadav Resident of Village- Dumriya, P.S.- Barh,
District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Raj Kishor Prasad, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP
For the Informant :	Md. Anwar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

6 10-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. A prayer for bail has been made on behalf of the petitioner in connection with Barh P.S. Case no.10 of 2013 registered under sections 147, 148, 302, 149, 341, 323, 325 of IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Allegation in the F.I.R is that seven named accused persons including the petitioner herein caused injury to the husband and father-in-law of the informant through *lathi* and sticks. There is specific allegation that the firing opened by accused Ashok Yadav caused injury upon the head of the father-in-law of the informant and the fire opened by the accused Suli Yadav caused injury to the husband of the informant, as a result



of which both succumbed to their injuries.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner that he fired upon the informant's husband, is not corroborated by the post-mortem report, as no firearm injury has been found on the head of the deceased, Nunulal Yadav. It is further submitted that the witnesses are not eye-witnesses to the occurrence and co-accused Ashok Yadav, against whom there was a specific allegation of firing at the head of the deceased, has already been granted the privilege of regular bail vide order dated 29.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 31083 of 2025. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 09.08.2024 and undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State as also learned counsel for the informant on the ground that the petitioner has absconded for a long time as the case being of the year 2013 and that he has been in custody only since 09.08.2024. It is further submitted that the case relates to a double murder with specific allegation against the petitioner of having fired upon the head of the informant's husband and that after framing of charge on 19.03.2025, the trial has progressed and three prosecution witnesses have already



been examined. It is also submitted that the petitioner has four criminal antecedents.

6. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts of the case and also considering that trial is in progress and three prosecution witnesses have already been examined and the present case is of the year 2013, the Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage, however, learned trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same preferably within a period of six months without giving unnecessary adjournment, failing which the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

