

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78180 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-290 Year-2025 Thana- JAYNAGAR District- Madhubani

Ranjeet Kumar Yadav, S/o Mr. Kishori Sharan Yadav, R/o Village- Mahua
Ekdera, P.S- Khajauli, Distt.- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Thakur, Advocate Ms. Vaishnavi Singh, Advocate Mr. Ritwik Thakur, Advocate Mr. Purushottam Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 21-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Jaynagar P.S. Case No. 290 of 2025, dated-19.08.2025
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 25(1-B)a
& 26 of the arms act.

3. As per allegation, one country made pistol besides
some live cartridges has been recovered from the possession of
the Petitioner without any license.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this



case. He further submits that though, as per the prosecution case, the illegal arms has been recovered from the bag being carried by the Petitioner, but the same bag has not been seized. Hence, the prosecution case is not reliable. He also submits that the procedure as prescribed for search and seizure has not been followed, and hence, vitiate the whole seizure of the armed vehicle, which is the basis of this case. He further submits that charge sheet in this case has already been submitted and there is no requirement of the Petitioner in the investigation.

5. He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 20.08.2025.

6. It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has earlier been made accused in one other case.

7. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

8. However, learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, **this application is allowed**, directing the petitioner, above-named, to be enlarged on bail on his furnishing bail bonds in the



sum of Rs. 10,000 /- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Concerned Court below in connection with Jainagar P.S. Case No. 290 of 2025 on the following conditions:

(i) The petitioner will make himself available for interrogation by a police officer/court as and when required.

(ii) The petitioner will undertake that investigation/trial will not get hampered on account of his absence or non-cooperation. He must be available to the police or the court whenever his presence is required.

(iii) The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer.

(iv) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that the petitioner has criminal antecedents other than the disclosed one, learned court below shall cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner after hearing him and getting satisfied that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents despite his knowledge of the same.

(v) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that statement regarding previous bail petition is wrong,



learned court below shall cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Jitendra Kumar, J.)

Chandan/-

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

