

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84839 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-111 Year-2025 Thana- PALI District- Jehanabad

- 
1. Sunil Kumar @ Majak Yadav S/o- Ram Swarath Prasad R/v- Rampur Bare PS- Pali Dist- Jehanabad
  2. Vikash Kumar S/o- Ravindra Yadav R/v- Rampur Bare Ps- Pali Dist- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mayank Raj, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Vinod Shanker Modi, APP

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      24-12-2025                      Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during pendency of the instant application for anticipatory bail, petitioner no.1, Sunil Kumar @ Majak Yadav has been arrested by the police and, as such, this application has become infructuous in respect of petitioner no.1.

2. Accordingly, he seeks permission to withdraw the applicatiion for anticipatory bail in connection with petitioner no.1.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. The present application for anticipatory bail in respect of petitioner no.1, Sunil Kumar @ Majak Yadav stands dismissed as withdrawn having become infructuous.



5. Now, the prayer for anticipatory bail with respect to petitioner no.2, Vikash Kumar remains to be adjudicated.

6. The petitioner no.2 is apprehending his arrest in connection with Pali P.S. Case No. 111 of 2025, dated 11.09.2025 registered for the offences under Sections 351(2), 357, 109 of the B.N.S. and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

7. As per prosecution case, the petitioners came at the house of the informant by Scorpio, abused him and told him to leave the land otherwise he would be killed. It is further alleged that the petitioner and three un-identified persons on the same day, boarded on Scorpio, came at his door and made three rounds of firing with an intention to kill him.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case. Counsel for the petitioner, by taking this Court to the allegations made in the F.I.R., submits that for the similar allegation, Sunil Kumar @ Majak Yadav was subsequently arrested during pendency of the instant bail application in which he was petitioner no.1, whose anticipatory bail petition was also rejected because of his antecedent and after arrest, he has been granted regular bail by the learned court below itself and, as such, there is no cogent reason for not entertaining the



anticipatory bail application, which has been rejected on the ground that the petitioner no.2 has one criminal antecedent and the case is still under investigation. It is further submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioner is frivolous and for ulterior reasons, the petitioner has been implicated in the instant case. It is further submitted that the land dispute which has been narrated by the informant, to which this petitioner is in no way related and he undertakes that the petitioner will take all measures to ensure that such allegation would not occur in future.

9. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail.

10. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

11. Let the petitioner no.2, above named, be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Jehanabad in



connection with Pali P.S. Case No. 111 of 2025 subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.

12. It is made clear that if such allegation of threatening or harassing the informant is complained in future before the police and on investigation if the allegations are found to be correct then the Investigating Officer of this case would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the privilege of anticipatory bail extended to the accused persons.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

rishi/-

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

