

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44887 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2025 Thana- DHANARUA District- Patna

=====

Dipak Yadav S/O Late Chhotu Yadav R/O Village- Daulta, P.S- Dhanarua,
Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jay Ram Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 10-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Dhanarua P.S. Case No.183/2025 dated 16.03.2025,
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 74, 109(1), 324(4), 303(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S.S.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that on 16.03.2025 at about 4.00 P.M., all the accused
persons including the petitioner came variously armed and
started abusing, on protest, all the accused persons started
assaulting the informant by iron rod and Garasa. It is next
alleged that Indal Yadav assaulted the informant by an iron rod
causing cut injury on his wrist, thereafter Rudal Yadav assaulted



the informant by an iron rod causing injury on his nose, ear and shoulder and when the informant's daughter and wife came to save him, the accused assaulted them also, further the petitioner assaulted the informant's daughter by an iron rod causing severe injury on her head, further Puja Devi and Mamta Devi also assaulted the informant's wife causing injury on her left leg and Rudal snatched informant's gold chain and mobile and petitioner snatched gold locket of informant's daughter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the informant's daughter by iron rod causing severe injury on head, as such the doctors have reserved the opinion with regard to the injury. The learned APP also submits that allegation against the petitioner is of assaulting a women by an iron rod on head. It is next submitted that investigation in the case is in its nascent



stages.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

