

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14654 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-200 Year-2025 Thana- CHANDRADIP District- Jamui

1. Pukari Yadav @ Pukari Kumar S/O Late Naresh Yadav R/O Vill.- Bhaaluaana, P.S.- Chandradeep, Dist.- Jamui.
2. Bibhishan Kumar @ Bibhishan Yadav S/O Mahadeo Yadav R/O Vill.- Bhaaluaana, P.S.- Chandradeep, Dist.- Jamui.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Brajesh Sahay, Adv Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Adv Ms. Harshita, Adv Ms. Amrita Kumari, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Md. Matloob Rab, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 29-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Chandradeep P.S. Case No. 200 of 2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 109, 3(5) of B.N.S. and Section 27 of Arms Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that on 18.11.2025 at about 04:00 P.M, the informant's son Randhir Kumar Yadav had gone to Gautam Mistry in Aliganj bazar for some private work regarding tractor repair. While he was standing there getting his work done by the mechanic suddenly



09 individuals arrived and fired on the informant's son due to which informant's son was severely injured. Based on the information provided by informant's son that the attacker include 1. Pukari Yadav, 2. Bibhishan Yadav, 3. Bhushan Yadav, 4. Rambilas Yadav, 5. Pankaj Yadav, one bullet struck the informant son's right hand while another bullet struck in his leg after that all the accused has fled away from the place of occurrence on a Apache Motorcycle and on other vehicles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the present case. They have nothing to do with the alleged occurrence. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioners. He further submits that the petitioners have two criminal antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer of anticipatory bail.

6. In the FIR, there is allegation against the petitioners that they along with other co-accused fired bullet gun shot on Randhir Kumar Yadav. In the impugned order, the learned Court below has also noticed that the injury report of Randhir Kumar Yadav shows that he has sustained fire arm injury. The petitioner no. 1 has four criminal antecedents and the petitioner no. 2 has



three criminal antecedents, the details of which have been brought on record by way of supplementary affidavit. Considering these aspects of the matter and particularly the fact that the petitioners appear to be habitual offenders, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

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

