

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2926 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-180 Year-2025 Thana- JALE District- Darbhanga

1. Ram Sikil Yadav S/o Late Nandu Yadav @ Nand Yadav R/o village - Bhimarpura , P.S - Jale , District - Darbhanga
2. Ravindra Yadav @ Ravindra Kumar S/o Ram Sikil Yadav R/o village - Bhimarpura , P.S - Jale , District - Darbhanga
3. Ram Prayag Yadav S/o Late Nandu Yadav @ Nand Yadav R/o village - Bhimarpura , P.S - Jale , District - Darbhanga
4. Sanjit Yadav @ Sanjit Kumar S/o Ram Prayag Yadav R/o village - Bhimarpura , P.S - Jale , District - Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 23-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner no.1, 2 and 4 apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 127(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 109, 352, 351, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner no.1, 2 and 4 submits that petitioners have antecedent of one case, but the said case was also instituted by the side of the informant. It is next submitted that the informant alleges that on 09.09.2025 at 11:00



PM, she along with her husband was irrigating their field when accused persons came and tied her husband and thereafter assaulted by knife causing injury on mouth, eye and also assaulted by brick causing fracture of bone of chest and her husband was taken to hospital from where he was referred to PMCH.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that parties are on a litigating term with respect to a land which the side of the informant intends to capture, which is objected by the side of the petitioners. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that though there is allegation of assault by knife and brick but then allegation of assault is not specific rather the allegation of assault is general and omnibus in nature. It is further submitted that the date of occurrence is 09.09.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on 18.09.2025, based on a written application of the informant. It is further submitted that had the husband of the informant been assaulted in the manner as alleged in the FIR, in that event the FIR would have been based on the fardbayan of the injured or the fardbayan of the informant would have been



recorded at the hospital but then that is not the case, which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution that as to whether the occurrence as alleged ever took place in the manner alleged. It is also submitted that from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that the FIR was instituted on 18.09.2025 and the same was seen by the learned ACJM-1 on 07.10.2025 i.e. after a delay of more than 20 days, which also casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that no doubt the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature but whether the injury was caused by the petitioner or the occurrence took place in some other manner and the petitioners came to be implicated on account of previous dispute is an aspect of investigation. It is fairly submitted that a process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued on 16.01.2026 but then it is submitted that petitioners were not absconding rather were availing their remedies available in law and had approached the learned District Court by filing ABP No.1550 of 2025, which came to be rejected by an order dated 24.12.2025 but by then the High Court was closed, as such after opening of the High Court, the petitioners filed the instant anticipatory bail application and during pendency of the same the process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. came to be issued. It is thus reiterated and submitted that petitioners



were not absconding rather were availing their remedies, in accordance with law.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that the FIR has been instituted after a delay of nine days of the occurrence and 20 days thereafter it was sent to the learned District Court and the FIR has been instituted based on a written application and not on fardbayan of the injured or the informant.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioner no.1, 2 and 4 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 bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Jalley P.S. Case No.180/2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

