

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43686 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-396 Year-2025 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

Vinod Kumar Son of Rajendra Yadav @ Rajendra Prasad Yadav Resident of
Village - Jaipalpatti, Ward No.- 15, Madhepura, P.S.- Madhepura, District -
Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate Mr. Dhandev Kumar, Advocate Mr. Sumit Kr. Gupta, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Yogendra Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, Sr. Advocate Mr. Durgesh Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rameshwar Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-07-2025 Heard Mr. Sharda Nand Mishra, learned counsel

for the petitioner, Mr. Krishna Pd. Singh, learned senior counsel

appearing on behalf of the informant as well as Mr. Yogendra

Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Madhepura (Bharrahi O.P.) P.S. Case No. 396
of 2025, F.I.R. dated 26.03.2025 for the offences punishable
under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 308(4), 303(2), 352, 351(2)
and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. According to prosecution case, due to some land
dispute this petitioner on the order of co-accused, Rajendra



Yadav brutally assaulted the informant and his brother due to which they sustained grievous injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. It appears from the F.I.R that due to some admitted land dispute the present occurrence has taken place. There is case and counter case between the parties. Although there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he has assaulted to the informant and his family members but no injury report is available on record to suggest that same. He further submits that the petitioner is a government employee and he was not present at the place of occurrence.

5. The learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the informant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the F.I.R it appears that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner that he has assaulted to the informant and his brother, namely, Bimal Kumar. Learned senior counsel for the informant has produced



the final injury report of the injured persons which suggest that the injuries received by the injured persons are grievous in nature.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Madhepura (Bharrahi O.P.) P.S. Case No. 396 of 2025 pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhepura.

7. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

