

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75618 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2024 Thana- Kawaiya District- Lakhisarai

Mantu Yadav Son of Brahmdeo Yadav @ Barahamdeo Yadav Resident of
Village- Jaynagar, Barhi, Kabaiya, P.S.- Kabaiya, Distt.- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amrendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 11-11-2024 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Kabaiya
P.S. Case No.70 of 2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 341 /447 /323 /354B /354C /385 /
307/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections
66(E)/67(A) of the I.T. Act.

3. As per prosecution, FIR has been lodged
against four named accused persons including the present
petitioner alleging therein that nephew of one Mahesh Yadav
has taken video of neighbour, on oppose husband of informant



reached then the accused persons had brutally assaulted the informant's husband due to which he sustained injury.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that from the content of the FIR it becomes crystal clear that the same video was alleged to be recorded by the nephew of Mahesh Yadav. He submits that the name of the petitioner has been inserted in this case only due to the reason that he is relative. Counsel submits that he was not present at the house and he went in the field for work. Counsel further submits that antecedent of the petitioner is clean.

5. Learned Counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that in the FIR it is alleged that informant's husband was assaulted and in the rejection order Court has acknowledged upon going through the medical report mentioned in the case-diary, according to which the injury was grievous in nature.

6. As such, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is refused. Petitioner is directed to surrender within four weeks. In case, compromise takes place between the parties, the Trial Court is directed to consider his prayer



for bail on merit on the same day without being prejudiced by
the order of this Court.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

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

