

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91312 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-189 Year-2024 Thana- BANMANKHI District- Purnia

Raja Yadav S/o- Harinandan Yadav @ Budhan Yadav Village- Shyam, Ward
no-10, P.S- Gawalpara, Distt-Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Kumar Prabhakar, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

3 11-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State as also learned counsel for the informant. Perused
the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with
Banmankhi P.S. Case No. 189 of 2024 instituted for the offence
under Sections 302, 394, 427 of the Indian Penal Code and
Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. On 17.05.2024, four armed criminals intercepted a
CSP operator, fired gunshots, and looted a cash-filled bag from
their motorcycle. During the scuffle, the CSP operator was shot
and injured, while the assailants fled toward *Hridaynagar*.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner
that the petitioner is in custody since 13-06-2025. Petitioner



bears fourteen (14) criminal antecedents, as per disclosure made in paragraph No. 3 of the bail application.

5. It has been further submitted by the petitioner's counsel that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. Name of the petitioner has surfaced in this case on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused, namely, Nitish Kumar Rishideo. The FIR reveals that the incident occurred in broad daylight with accused having uncovered faces, and eyewitnesses Gulab Rishideo and Sanjay Paswan claimed to identify the accused, yet the petitioner was not identified in the TIP. Charge is framed in this case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that postmortem report corroborates the allegation against the petitioner. Bail of similarly situated co-accused persons have been rejected by this Court vide order dated 05.05.2025, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5736 of 2025.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, there being cogent material against the petitioner in the case diary coupled with the fact that since the trial is in progress, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Prayer for grant of bail is, accordingly, *rejected*.



8. The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial as expeditiously as possible without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

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

