

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53616 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2025 Thana- DUMRAO District- Buxar

RAJU YADAV S/O ARJUN YADAV R/O Chunni Kamkar Ki Gali Dumraon,
P.S. - Dumraon, Dist. - Buxar, At Present No. M-95, S Block Gali No. 6,
Shashtri Nagar North West, P.S.- Shashtri Nagar, Dist.- Shashtri Nagar, Delhi.
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Shankar Pathak, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 08-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2),
190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 125, 76, 303(2) and 352 of
the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that accused persons including the petitioner stopped the
informant when he was going to his field and on objection all
the accused assaulted him. Further, petitioner assaulted Babita
Devi by sword causing injury on her eye while Sonu Yadav
acted inappropriately with Sunita Devi and Ravindra Yadav



snatched chain of his daughter-in-law. Further, on account of assault there was vision loss.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that initially when the FIR was instituted, the same was instituted with respect to the offences carrying punishment of seven years and less but then during the course of investigation, the police found the case true under Section 109 BNSS. It is next submitted that though in the FIR, it is alleged that petitioner assaulted Babita Devi by sword causing injury on her eye leading to vision loss but then from perusal of Annexure-A to the counter affidavit filed by the Superintendent of Police, Buxar, it would manifest that the same contains case summary of Babita Devi issued by the IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna wherein it has been recorded that Babita Devi was assaulted by a brick. It is, thus, submitted that only to give seriousness to the case, the informant falsely in the FIR alleged that petitioner assaulted Babita Devi by sword.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. It is submitted that from perusal of the injury report issued by the Medical Officer, Sadar



Hospital, Dumraon, Buxar, it would manifest that the same records that Babita Devi suffered injury by hard blunt substance and the victim was referred to the PMCH, Patna for further treatment. It is further submitted that no doubt, in the case summary issued by the IGIMS, Sheikhpura, Patna, it is recorded that Babita Devi was assaulted by brick but then the injury has been found to be grievous and Babita Devi has suffered loss of vision and the investigation of the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Dumraon P.S. Case No. 22 of 2025 pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Buxar/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

