

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48122 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4 Year-2025 Thana- ANDHRAMATH District- Madhubani

Gajendra Yadav aged 22 years S/O Rajdev Yadav R/O Village- Hariraha, P.S-
Andhramath, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arvind Kumar, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem, Adv

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

3 08-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is in custody in connection with
Andhramath P.S Case No. 04 of 2025 (GR. 36/2025) registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109,
118, 76, 303(2), 351(2), 351(3), 352, 3(5) of the BNS.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, petitioner along with
the other accused persons have assaulted the informant and his
family members.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next
submits that both the parties are neighbour and living opposite
to each other and there was a dispute regarding throwing



garbage in front of each other's house and due to this, minor scuffling took place among them. He further submits that no incriminating article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He further submits that no independent witness has supported the version of the informant. It is also submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody since 04.05.2025 having one antecedent.

5. However, learned APP for the State oppose the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the FIR, entire case diary, injury report and impugned order dated 19.06.2025, it appears that petitioner is named in the FIR and there is direct allegation against the petitioner to assault Geeta Devi with Dabiya on head. On perusal of injury report of Geeta Devi, it appears that there is a sharp cutting wound on left side of the occipital region which is caused by sharp cutting like object. On perusal of paragraph 10 to paragraph 15 of the case diary it also appears that witnesses has supported the prosecution case. So, considering all fact and circumstances of this case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the regular bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.



8. However, petitioner is at liberty that he may renew
his prayer for bail on completion of one year in custody.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Sunnykr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

