

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44488 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2025 Thana- CHANDI District- Nalanda

1. Abhishek Kumar @ Chintu Kumar Son of Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav R/o Village Gosaimath ,P.S. Chandi District Nalanda
2. Gorakh Kumar @ Gorak Kumar Son of Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav R/o Village Gosaimath ,P.S. Chandi District Nalanda
3. Pintu Kumar Son of Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav R/o Village Gosaimath ,P.S. Chandi District Nalanda
4. Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav Son of Late Dwarka Yadav R/o Village Gosaimath ,P.S. Chandi District Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dr. Anjani Pd. Singh, Advocate Mr. Sunny Kumar, Advocate Mr. Saurav Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Narsingh Tanti, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 16-07-2025 Heard Dr. Anjani Parsad Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Chandi P.S. Case No. 77 of 2025 for the offence under Sections 190, 191(1), 115(2), 126(2), 74, 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Amrs Act lodged on 24.02.2025 by the informant Nikki Devi.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleges that while she was at home, the petitioner nos. 1 & 3 Abhishek Kumar @ Chintu Kumar and Pintu Kumar came and while the



petitioner no. 1 tried to bring her out of home, as she raised alarm, Pintu Kumar threw her on the bed, she anyhow tried to escape but as she raised alarm, the husband came and started chasing the two accused, the allegation is that all the accused persons came and assaulted her husband. The role of Ashok Yadav is there, which injured her husband near the eyebrows. Further allegation is against one Tunnu of snatching the Manglasutra. The allegation against Ramanamd Yadav is of outraging her modesty while allegation of indiscriminate firing is against Gorakh Yadav and Nishu Yadav beside Chintu. This led to the F.I.R.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the exaggerated F.I.R. is there and everyone has been implicated which includes the students. The allegation of firing is there, no injury has been found so far as assault is concerned, it is attributed to Ashok Yadav.

5. Learned APP opposes the prayer submitting that the author of the entire episode is petitioner no. 1 Chintu Kumar and petitioner no. 3 Pintu Kumar which led to the ultimate assault and injury to the informant's husband.

6. Taking into account the aforesaid facts as also the submissions, so far the anticipatory bail of the petitioner no. 1,



Abhishek Kumar @ Chintu Kumarr and petitioner no. 3, Pintu Kumar is/are concerned, the same is rejected.

7. So far as the petitioner no. 2, Gorakh Kumar @ Gorak and the petitioner no. 4 Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav is concerned, in that background, this Court is inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no. 2, Gorakh Kuamr @ Gorak Kumar and the petitioner no. 4, Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav.

8. Let the petitioner no. 2, Gorakh Kumar @ Gorak Kumar and petitioner no. 4, Rajnandan Yadav @ Raju Yadav be released on bail in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ACJM-I, Hilsa, in connection with Chandi P.S. Case No. 77 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C., as also with the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailor should be the family member/relative of the petitioners who shall provide official document to show their bona fide;

(ii) the petitioners shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive



dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioners shall appear before the concerned police station every fortnight for next six months to mark their attendance;

(iv) the petitioners shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(v) the petitioners shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of bail bonds.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

