

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4793 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-169 Year-2025 Thana- CHANPATIA District- West Champaran

Shivlal Yadav Son of Late Suraj Yadav Resident of Vill. - Miskar Tola, Ward
No-14, P.S.- Chanpatiya, Dist.- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Sanjeev Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey- A.P.P.
	Mr.Krishna Kant Pandey
	Ms.Purnima Kumari

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 23-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Chanpatiya P. S. Case No.169 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 117(2),
109(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and in sum and
substance, the allegation is that petitioner assaulted Rajeshwar
Yadav by garasa causing injury on head.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner and the informant are agnates and are having dispute



relating to land. It is next submitted that initially when the injury report was submitted, the same opined the injury to be simple in nature, though was on vital part of the body, but then, from perusal of the order impugned, it would manifest that the same records that the injury report was objected by the side of the informant, as such, the Court called for an opinion on the injury received by Rajeshwar Yadav and the opinion which was furnished to the Court by the Pharmacists of the P.H.C. recorded that earlier injury report was issued without consulting the senior doctors but after the senior doctors were consulted, it was found that the injured suffered fracture frontal bone on left side of the head and the same was opined to be grievous in nature which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the second injury report was furnished based on the orders of the Court and the injury report clearly recorded that the injury suffered by the injured was opined to be grievous after consulting the senior doctors of the P.M.C.H. It is also submitted that head is a vital part of the body and the investigation is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned



A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

