

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2350 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-310 Year-2024 Thana- PALIGANJ District- Patna

1. Mahendar Yadav S/o Late Shiv Pujan Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
2. Okender Yadav S/o Late Shiv Pujan Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
3. Upendar Yadav S/o Late Shiv Pujan Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
4. Anil Yadav S/o Late Shiv Pujan Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
5. Nirbhay Kumar S/o Okendar Yadav @ Okender Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
6. Deepak Kumar S/o Late Surendar Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna
7. Vivek Nandan Yadav @ Vivek Kumar S/o Late Surendar Yadav RO Village - Mahuari, PS- Piarpura, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhirendra Kumar Sinha, Adv. Ms. Soni Kumari, Adv. Mr. Amrit Pal, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2

27-04-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.
 2. Petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126, 115(2), 109, 308(3), 308(4), 352 of B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.
 3. Learned counsel for the petitioners at the outset



seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no.3, who was arrested.

4. Permission is accorded.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 has antecedent of nine cases, petitioner no.2 has antecedent of six cases, petitioner no.4 has antecedent of four cases, petitioner no.5 has antecedent of two cases, petitioner no.6 has antecedent of one case and petitioner no.7 is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 06.08.2024 at about 9 P.M., he was coming back home, when eleven named accused persons including the petitioners intercepted him and started abusing and put pistol on his forehead and demanded extortion of Rs.5 lacs on the pretext that being Mukhiya, have earned a lot but the informant managed to escape.

6. 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 allegations are general and omnibus in nature though informant alleges that accused persons including the petitioners on point of pistol demanded extortion. It is further submitted that it does not



appear probable that where eleven accused persons would have intercepted the informant, the petitioners could have managed to escape by starting his motorcycle. It is also submitted that Saroj Yadav had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.53259 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 18.08.2025, thereafter Vimal Kumar Raushan also approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.75856 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 11.02.2026. It is thus submitted that petitioners be also granted the privilege of anticipatory bail. It is also submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove their innocence.

7. Learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners and submits that Saroj Yadav had antecedent of one case and Vimal Kumar Raushan had antecedent of five cases but in the instant case, petitioner no.1 has antecedent of nine cases, petitioner no.2 has antecedent of six cases and petitioner no.4, 5 and 6 also have antecedent of 4, 2 and 1 case. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioners may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence. It is further submitted that merely



because Vimal Kumar Raushan and Saroj Yadav have been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail, the same does not entitle the petitioners to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no.1 and 2.

9. The anticipatory bail application of petitioner no.1, namely, Mahendar Yadav and petitioner no.2, namely, Okender Yadav is rejected.

10. However, petitioner no.4, 5, 6 and 7, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rs. Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Danapur, in connection with Paliganj P.S. Case No.310 of 2024, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

11. It is made clear that one close relative of petitioners shall be one of their bailors.

12. It is also made clear that in the event, if any application is filed by the Investigating Officer before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioners, despite



giving assurance to this Court, are not cooperating in the investigation, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners after recording reasons.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

