

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78716 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-116 Year-2025 Thana- GOPALPUR District- Bhagalpur

Bikash Yadav S/O Surendra Yadav Resident of Village Laxmipur, P.S-
Ismailpur, Dist-Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Yadav, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 04-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Gopalpur P.S. Case No.116/2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 105 and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that her husband had gone to cut grass for his cattle, when he came in contact with naked electric wire which the accused persons including the petitioner had kept for watering their field, next alleges that accused persons were asked to remove the wire earlier but they did not pay any heed nor removed the wire, further her father-in-law and elder brother-in-law saw the accused persons including the petitioner dragging the dead body of her husband away from the field.
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 informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence. It is also submitted that no naked wire was found from the place of occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that husband of the informant died. It is also submitted that though informant is not an eyewitness to the occurrence but then she alleges in the FIR that she was informed by her father-in-law and elder brother-in-law that her husband came in contact with naked electric wire kept in the field of the petitioner, on account of which, he died. It is also submitted that why a wife would falsely implicate someone who was not involved in the occurrence.

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	
---	--	---	--

