

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13194 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-169 Year-2021 Thana- BASANTPUR District- Siwan

Ramesh Kumar Yadav @ Ramesh Yadav S/O Bali Ram Yadav @ Baliram Ray R/O Village- Sipar, P.S- Basantpur, Dist.- Siwan, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhijeet Abhigyan, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 19-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Basantpur P.S. Case No. 169 of 2021 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 324, 307, 379, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner had earlier moved this court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.42482 of 2024 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 13.08.2024, as the informant alleged that he was assaulted by the petitioner by knife causing injury on head and the injury was sharp cut.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that



no doubt petitioner has antecedent of three cases but then all the cases were settled in the Lok Adalat as would manifest from Annexure-P/3 series to the second anticipatory bail application. It is further submitted that the present occurrence occurred on account of dispute relating to land in between the petitioner and the informant. It is further submitted that from side of petitioner also Basantpur P.S. Case No.195 of 2021 was instituted against the informant and his side. It is also submitted that even side of the petitioner got injured. It is next submitted that petitioner and the informant on intervention of well-wishers have compromised the case, as such the instant second anticipatory bail application has been filed.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant Mr. Shankar Kumar does not dispute the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner rather submits that he will have no objection in the event if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner.

6. Learned APP opposes the second anticipatory bail application and submits that the case was instituted under section 307 of the IPC also and the said offence is not a compoundable offence but if informant is not opposing the second anticipatory bail application, in that event, the petitioner



can surrender and seek regular bail, based on the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, as recorded, hereinabove.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the court is in agreement with the submission made by the learned APP Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the second anticipatory bail application with liberty to the petitioner to surrender and seek regular bail, the learned counsel for the informant submits that if the petitioner surrenders and files an application seeking regular bail, the same shall not be opposed.

9. Accordingly, the second anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is dismissed as withdrawn with aforesaid liberty.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

