

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78827 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-110 Year-2024 Thana- Mau District- Gaya

Hari Yadav @ Harilal Yadav Son of Bablu Yadav @ Bullu Yadav R/o Village
- Kamalpur, P.S.- Mau, District - Gaya Ji, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Vinod Shanker Modi, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 29-01-2026 Heard Mr. Sanjay Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Arvind Kumar, learned counsel for the informant and Mr. Vinod Shanker Modi, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since 03.09.2025 in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 110 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 23.12.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 137(2) and 140(3) of the BNS, 2023.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant's son was last seen with this petitioner and since then, he was traceless.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been



implicated in the present case. It appears from the F.I.R that the date of occurrence is 09.11.2024 but the present F.I.R has been instituted on 23.12.2024 i.e., after delay of about 45 days without giving any explanation of the said delay. The petitioner has been made accused merely on the basis of suspicion and except the suspicion, no other cogent material has come during investigation which suggests the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. He further submits that the police after investigation submitted the charge sheet against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 03.09.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the victim was last seen with the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the F.I.R has been instituted after delay of about 45 days, petitioner has clean antecedent and except suspicion no other material has come during investigation which suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned J.M. 1st Class,



Gaya Ji in connection with Mau P.S. Case No. 110 of 2024,
subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

