

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80761 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2025 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

Mintu Yadav @ Mantu Yadav S/o Late Doman Yadav R/O Village-
Shankarpur Milky Tola, P.S.- Mufassil, Distt.- Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 90350 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2025 Thana- MUNGER MUFFASIL District- Munger

Devan Yadav S/O Late Bhuvneshwar Yadav R/vill- Shankerpur, Milki Tola,
P.S.- Mufassil, Distt- Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 80761 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Karuna Sahay, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Indihar Kumari, APP

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 90350 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jyoti Ranjan Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 20-02-2026 Both the cases are being taken up together as they are
arising out of some P.S.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

3. The petitioners seek bail in connection with
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 79 of 2025 for the offences punishable
under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 103(1), 109 of the B.N.S.
and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

4. Allegation in the F.I.R is that all the FIR named
accused persons including the petitioner came at the door of the



informant and made indiscriminate firing upon the informant and his family members due to which informant's son died during treatment.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that although the petitioners are named in the FIR but from bare perusal of FIR, it appears that there is no specific allegation of any assault or overt act or firing attributed against the petitioners rather there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners. Further, similarly situated co-accused Anil Yadav has been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 27.01.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 82209 of 2025. He further submits that charges have been framed on 03.02.2026 and there is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future. The petitioners are in custody since 16.03.2025 and 24.03.2025 respectively and undertake to co-operate in case/trial.

6. Application for bail of petitioner Mintu Yadav is opposed by learned APP of the State on the ground that he has three criminal antecedents. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is on bail in the aforesaid cases.

7. Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts and



circumstances of the case and also considering the general and omnibus nature of allegations against the petitioner coupled with the fact that similarly situated co-accused has been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court and charges have been framed, let the petitioners, above named, be released on bail on each of them furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No.79 of 2025, with the following conditions:

i. The petitioners shall remain physically present in the learned trial Court on each date and shall cooperate in the trial. In case the petitioners are absent on the two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, the learned trial Court would be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners.

ii. If the petitioners tamper with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

