

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86406 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-49 Year-2025 Thana- GOGRI District- Khagaria

Puran Yadav S/o Kapildev Yadav Resident of Village- Usri, Ward No. 14,
P.S.- Gogri, District- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gaurav Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umanath Mishra, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

4 17-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for regular bail in connection with Gogri P.S. Case No. 49 of 2025 instituted for the offence under Sections 126(2), 127(2), 115(2), 109, 308(5), 351(2) and 3(5) of BNS and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner has fired at the head of the informant's son due to which he sustained injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and committed no offence. He has further submitted that during investigation, the wife of the injured has given her statement before the police wherein she has stated that actually, one Aman has fired at her husband. Learned counsel



has further submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it is clear that the occurrence is of 20.02.2025 whereas the FIR was lodged on 25.02.2025. The delay has not been explained. Though the medical examination report supports the allegation but it is after-thought. Moreover, the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 24.06.2025.

5. Learned APP appearing for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer of regular bail and has submitted that during investigation, the injured has given his statement in para-14 of the case diary wherein he has categorically stated that the petitioner has fired at him in the head and the nature of injury is grievous as per injury report. He has further submitted that petitioner is having criminal antecedent of three cases.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that there is direct allegation against this petitioner, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and, as such, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

7. However, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months if the trial is not concluded.

8. Learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial



and conclude the same as within the period as stated above.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

Shubham/-

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

