

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78741 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-183 Year-2025 Thana- GOGRI District- Khagaria

- 
1. Dilkhush Yadav S/o Sahindra Yadav R/o vill - Gogri Kundi, P.s.- Gogri, Distt.- Khagaria
  2. Niranjana Yadav S/o Rambilash Yadav R/o vill - Gogri Kundi, P.s.- Gogri, Distt.- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vidyapati

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      04-12-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Gogri P.S. Case No.183/2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109, 303(2), 329(4), 352 and 351(2) of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 is a person with clean antecedent and petitioner no.2 has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that the accused persons including the petitioners on 25.07.2025 at 9 P.M. came to his rice mill variously armed and started



assaulting his truck driver Sikendra Yadav, further when informant tried to intervene, the accused got enraged and broke his truck, motorcycle and a pick up vehicle and thereafter indiscriminately assaulted the driver, further Dharmendra took away Rs.2 lacs while Ashish snatched his gold chain, further the accused fired causing injury on thigh on Manoj, thereafter police came when accused fled leaving behind their motorcycle. It is next alleged that the reason for the occurrence is that Dharmendra was seeking pass from his truck but since the road was single as such the driver could not give pass in time which enraged him and thus the occurrence was committed. It is also submitted that the entire occurrence has been captured in the CCTV of his shop.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have 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 in between Dharmendra and the driver of the truck with regard to taking pass, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is next submitted that no specific allegation of assault is alleged against the petitioners rather the allegations against the petitioners are general and omnibus in nature.



5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that no doubt there is no specific allegation against the petitioners of committing the occurrence of assault and firing but then the occurrence was captured in the CCTV and there is an allegation that accused persons fired causing firearm injury to Manoj on his thigh. It is submitted that the presence of the accused persons including the petitioners at the place of occurrence emboldened the accused who fired to commit the occurrence of firing. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is still continuing.

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

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

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

