

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90449 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2020 Thana- LAXMIPUR District- Jamui

Bhuplal Yadav @ Mukesh Yadav S/O Kinu Yadav R/O Village- Mangrar, P.S-
Mohanpur, Distt.- Jamui, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Rina Sinha, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Akash Raj, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 05-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned Senior counsel Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Laxmipur P.S. Case No.232 of 2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 324 and 302 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 03.04.2025 and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that he went to graze his cattle in the field on 15.06.2020 at 12 Noon, when named accused persons including the petitioner came variously armed and assaulted his father, it



is next alleged that even the accused persons chased the informant, who had gone to give food to his father, further the father of the informant was taken to hospital from where he was referred to a higher center but he died during the course of treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of assault is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that Baleshwar Yadav has been granted the privilege of regular bail by order dated 21.06.2023 in Cr. Misc. No.38042 of 2023, since charges against him was framed. It is further submitted that charges against the petitioner also stands framed.

5. Learned APP and the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the regular bail application of the petitioner and submits that no doubt the allegation of assault is not specific but then it is alleged that petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence and was carrying a pistol though death was not caused on account of firearm injury but petitioner has antecedent of three cases and



one of the case has been instituted with an allegation that he threatened the informant and his side for withdrawing the present FIR. It is also submitted that after framing of charge trial has commenced and one witness has been examined and four more witnesses remained to be examined. It is next submitted that when Baleshwar Yadav was granted the privilege of regular bail, at that time the charges were framed but the trial had not commenced. It is further submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submission made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. The regular bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

