

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9999 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-126 Year-2024 Thana- NAUHATTA District- Saharsa

Chandan Yadav @ Chandan Kumar Yadav S/O Bhagwat Yadav @ Bhargav
Yadav Resident of Village- Parwalpur, P.S.- Bheja, Dist.- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Iqbal Asif Niazi, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

3 27-06-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Nauhatta (Darhar O.P.) P.S. Case No. 126 of 2024
instituted for the offences under Sections 302, 201, 34, 120B of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case, in short, is that, accused persons
came to the house of the informant and took his son to attend
the marriage ceremony of co-accused Sunny Yadav. Informant
suspects that accused persons including the petitioner have
committed the murder of his son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that informant is not the eye-witness to the occurrence and the entire prosecution case is based on suspicion. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner is the co-villager and his name is being dragged in this case merely due to local village politics, enmity and personal grudge and the petitioner is not involved in the alleged occurrence. Learned counsel further submitted that, as a matter of fact, the petitioner attended the marriage ceremony of the co-accused Sunny Yadav solely in his professional capacity as a cameraman. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. Learned APP further submitted that petitioner is named in the FIR. He further submitted that the prayer for grant of bail to co-accused persons has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 22.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 59988 of 2024 and Cr. Misc. No. 88103 of 2024.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



of the case, nature and gravity of offence, in my view, this is not a fit case for anticipatory bail, hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today and prays for regular bail, the same shall be disposed of on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Alok Verma/-

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

