

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86221 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2023 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Vijay Kumar Son of Amod @ Duno Yadav R/o Village - Pokhram Ward no. 3,  
P.S. - Murliganj, Dist. - Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dinesh Prasad Verma, Advocate  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      24-02-2026                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 200 of 2023 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 342, 386, 302, 120B, 504 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that Anil Yadav and Bauaa Yadav have fired at the chest of the informant's husband. The third fire was made by one Nitish Kumar and after that the husband of the informant fell down and Sharawn Kumar and the petitioner also fired at him.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that the main thrust of the allegation is against Anil Yadav and Bauaa Yadav. He also submits that the allegation against the



petitioner is that he has fired at the husband of the informant and he fell down due to the fires made by Anil Yadav and Bauaa Yadav. He further submits that from perusal of the postmortem report of the deceased, it will transpire that there were only two entry wounds on the person of the deceased. He also submits that the postmortem does not support the allegations as leveled in the FIR. Moreover, a statement has been made in para 3 of the petition that petitioner has no criminal antecedent and he is languishing in judicial custody since 09.04.2025.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M., 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Madhepura in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 200 of 2023.

**(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)**

Sudhanshu/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

