

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.79157 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2018 Thana- PHULPARAS District- Madhubani

Saroj Yadav S/O Ram Ashish Yadav R/O Village- Bahuwarba, P.S.-
Phulparas, Dist.- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Hriday Narayan Harshit, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Choubey Jawahar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Advocate
		Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. This is the second attempt on behalf of the petitioner for grant of bail in connection with Phulparas P.S. Case No.138 of 2018 registered for the offence punishable under sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 385, 307, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and under section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected vide order dated 30.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 24318 of 2025, which reads as under:

*“Heard learned Senior Counsel for
the petitioner, learned APP for the State and
learned counsel for the informant.*

*2. This application for grant of
regular bail arises out of Phulparas P.S. Case
No.138 of 2018 registered for the offence
punishable under sections 147, 148, 149, 341,
385, 307, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code*



and under section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The petitioner and one Ashok Yadav are said to have caused gun shot injuries to the victim.

4. The petitioner is in custody since 19.12.2024. He is accused in five more criminal cases. The present F.I.R. has been lodged in the year 2018. The petitioner is an absconder for seven years.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner is said to have fired upon the victim and he is an absconder, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of regular bail. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected. If the trial is delayed by the prosecution, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the trial is being delayed by the informant and therefore, he may be granted bail considering the period of custody i.e., 19.12.2024.

5. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the witnesses are being produced by the prosecution and the prosecution is not delaying the trial.

6. Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the trial has started, I am not inclined to review my earlier order.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

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

