

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.4693 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-593 Year-2024 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

Mithilesh Yadav Son of Late Girija Yadav Resident of village- Mishrabigha
PS- Tehta (Makhadumpur), Dist -Jehanabad

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Manoj Kumar Son of Late Jatu Manjhi @ Jathu Manjhi Resident Of Village-
Aajdnagar, ps- Ghoshi, Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr.Amrendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Binay Krishna, A.P.P.
For the Respondent No.2:	:	Mr. P. Pankaj Raj Anand, Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5 12-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned
Special Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel for
the informant/Respondent No. 2 and perused the case diary.

2. The instant appeal has been filed by the appellant
against the order dated 04.09.2025 passed by 1st Addl. Sessions
Judge -cum- Special Judge SC/ST Act, Jehanabad, whereby the
prayer for bail of the appellant in connection with Ghoshi P.S.
Case No. 593 of 2024, under Section 103(1), 3(5) of Bharatiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act and
Section 3(2)(va) of the SC/ST Act, was rejected.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that petitioner along



with other co-accused persons named in the F.I.R., committed murder of father of the informant. It is alleged that cousin of the informant Babu Chandra Manjhi also sustained gun shot injury in the said occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that the appellant has not taken the caste name of the informant in public view. Hence, no offence under the provisions of SC/ST Act is made out against him. The appellant has no intention to disgrace the image of the informant in public view. The appellant is in custody since 09.06.2025 and has no criminal antecedent. The petitioner was identified by the informant.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the State and the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the appellant. Specific allegation of firing is against petitioner and one Ravi Yadav. In para 22 of the case diary injured specifically stated that petitioner and others had fired on deceased. He further stated that injured also sustained gun shot injury by the petitioner and other co-accused. There is serious allegation against the petitioner, therefore, he does not deserve to be



released on bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the Appellant at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the Appellant is, hereby, rejected.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

