

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40794 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2025 Thana- Karnamepur District- Bhojpur

Rajesh yadav @ Chaiya yadav S/o Govardhan Yadav Resident of village-
Mahuar, P.S.- Nainijor, Distt- Buxar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. B.N. Pnadey, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 25-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Karnamepur P.S. Case No. 27 of 2025 instituted for the offence under Sections 317(2), 317(5), 318(4), 338, 336(9), 111, 112 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. The case of the prosecution is that while acting on secret information police apprehended one Saroj Yadav who was found in possession of his stolen bike having Registration No. BR 03 AY 6709. It is alleged that from the plate affixed on the bike, it displayed incorrect registration number. At the instance of Saroj Yadav, one motorcycle was found in the Dalan of the co-accused Saroj Yadav which was not having any registration plate. Both Saroj Yadav and Suraj Yadav disclosed the name of this petitioner



as their associate. It is further case of the prosecution that one bike was recovered from the house of Rajesh Yadav @ Chaiya Yadav.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the seizure list a bike was recovered from his house but that seizure list does not bear the signature of any of the inmate of the house. The seizure list witnesses are police personnel. It has also been submitted that there is no FIR regarding the stolen bike.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail to the petitioner and has submitted that petitioner is having criminal antecedent of six cases out of which two are of similar nature. It is apparent from the order of the trial court also that the petitioner has not disclosed his antecedent before the trial court.

6. Having regard to the submissions noted hereinabove, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, however, he is directed to surrender before the trial court within four weeks. The trial court is directed to consider the prayer for bail of the petitioner on its own merit.

7. Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

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

