

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43879 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-491 Year-2019 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

-
1. Diggall Yadav @ Surendra Yadav Son of Khalthu Yadav R/O Village - Pansalla, P.S.- Muffasil (Lakho O.P.), District - Begusarai.
 2. Chhotu Kumar Son of Khalthu Yadav R/O Village - Pansalla, P.S.- Muffasil (Lakho O.P.), District - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kr. Singh, Advocate Mr. Sunil Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ram Sumiran Rai, A.P.P

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 16-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in connection with Muffasil (Lakho O.P.) P.S. Case No. 491 of 2019 lodged on 21.09.2019, for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 379 & 34 of the Indian Penal Code read with section 25 of the Animal Trespass Act, pending in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Begusarai.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against four named accused persons including the present petitioners against whom there is an allegation that they have assaulted the informant and also snatched Rs.40,000/- from the informant.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. Counsel submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics. Counsel submits that there is a land dispute going on between the parties. Counsel further submits that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that the petitioners have been specifically named in the FIR. Counsel further submits that the Sessions Judge has acknowledged in the order sheet that both accused persons were absconding and never co-operated with the investigation and now after lapse of six years, they have knocked the door of Court to get anticipatory bail.

6. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners are hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

