

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10085 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-251 Year-2024 Thana- Mehendiya District- Arwal

1. Vijay Chaudhary S/o Ruplal Chaudhary R/o Village - Sohasa, P.S - Mehendiya, District - Arwal
2. Vinod Chaudhary S/o Satendra Chaudhary R/o Village - Sohasa, P.S - Mehendiya, District - Arwal
3. Rohit Chaudhary S/o Satendra Chaudhary R/o Village - Sohasa, P.S - Mehendiya, District - Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Raju Kumar Singh, Adv. Ms. Drishti Mohan, Adv. Ms. Anju Kumari Sinha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State through virtual mode.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Mehendiya P.S. Case No. 251 of 2024 dated 26.12.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(1), 109, 74, 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, the allegations against the petitioners are that they in connivance with others assaulted the father of the informant, the informant along with one lady and the mother of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



though there is a specific allegation against the petitioner no. 1 namely, Vinod Chaudhary who assaulted the father of the informant namely, Rajdev Chaudhary causing grievous injury as per the injury report. However, the allegations upon the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 namely, Vinod Chaudhary and Rohit Chaudhary respectively, they assaulted Chotte Lal and the informant himself but the injuries sustained by them were found to be simple in nature. It has further been submitted that entire family has been falsely implicated in this case only to settle personal scores. It has further been submitted that two lady accused persons have been granted bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court and the said order has been brought on record by way of Annexure-P/2. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioners have clean antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and has stated that there is a specific allegation against the petitioner no. 1 namely, Vijay Chaudhary who assaulted Rajdev Chaudhary and he has admittedly received grievous injury and therefore, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Learned A.P.P. though has admitted the fact that the injuries sustained by the other injured persons were found to be simple



in nature.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner no. 1 namely, Vijay Chaudhary, and hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner no. 1, Vijay Chaudhary is rejected. The petitioner no. 1 may approach before the learned Court below concerned and pray for regular bail and the learned Court below may consider the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner no. 1 on its own merits without being prejudiced by this order.

7. So far as the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 namely, Vinod Chaudhary and Rohit Chaudhary are concerned, they are directed to 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-bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Mehendiya P.S. Case No. 251 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of BNSS as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the



petitioners.

(ii) The petitioners shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bonds of the petitioners will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) The trial court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case, at any stage, it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the trial court shall take necessary steps for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioners. 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.

8. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.

9. The application stands allowed with respect to the petitioner nos. 2 and 3 namely, Vinod Chaudhary and Rohit Chaudhary.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Gautam/-

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

