

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12041 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-126 Year-2024 Thana- NAUHATTA District- Saharsa

Sanni Yadav @ Sanny Deol Kumar S/O Sushil yadav Village- Bharagama, Ps-
Bheja, District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s
Versus
The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in Nauhatta P.S.
Case No. 126 of 2024, registered under Sections 302, 201, 34 ad
120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that accused
persons came to the house of the informant and took his son to
attend the marriage ceremony of the petitioner. The informant
suspects that accused persons including the petitioner have
committed murder of his son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the



present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that no specific overt act has been attributed against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that the informant is not an eye witness to the alleged occurrence. It is further submitted that the deceased went to attend the marriage ceremony of the petitioner due to which he has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is specific allegation of committing murder of informant's son against the petitioner along with other co-accused persons. It is further submitted that the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to other co-accused person has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 27.06.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9999 of 2025. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular



bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

