

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2027 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2025 Thana- Bhalpatti District- Darbhanga

Surendra Yadav @ Surendra Kumar Yadav @ Sulendra Kumar Yadav @
Guddu S/O Late Suresh Yadav R/O Village - Nainaghat, P.S- Sadar, District- -
Darbhanga.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Advocate
Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-01-2026 Heard Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. Petitioner seeks bail who is in custody since
12.11.2025 in connection with Bhalpatti P.S. Case No. 36 of
2025, F.I.R. dated 02.05.2025 for the offences punishable under
Sections 189(2), 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 109, 329(4), 352 of the
B.N.S.

3. According to prosecution case, when the informant
was making bread in her house, the petitioner and the co-
accused persons came at her door and started abusing at the
instance of the co-accused, Pramod Yadav. On objection by the
informant, the co-accused, Sita Devi assaulted her and caught



her and the co-accused, Ravindra Yadav and the petitioner dragged the informant to their courtyard and on the order of the co-accused, Pramod Yadav all the accused persons assaulted her. In the meantime, the petitioner with an intention to kill assaulted the informant with iron rod on her head, causing head injury. Thereafter, she was taken to Sadar Hospital where the doctor referred the informant to D.M.C.H. for better treatment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. There is specific allegation against the petitioner of assaulting the informant by means of iron rod although she has received injury but there is no intention to kill anyone and there is no repetition of blow upon the informant. There is case and counter case between the parties. It appears from the FIR that due to some petty dispute the present occurrence took place. The petitioner is in custody since 12.11.2025.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned C.J.M., Darbhanga in connection with Bhalpatti P.S. Case No. 36 of



2025, subject to the following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

atul/-

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

