

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15011 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-420 Year-2025 Thana- KHAIRA District- Jamui

1. Ranjeet Yadav S/o Hulas Yadav R/o Village - Dayaldih, P.S - Khaira, District - Jamui
2. Dinesh Kumar @ Dinesh Yadav S/o Sri Nagi Yadav R/o Village - Dayaldih, P.S - Khaira, District - Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 28-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Khaira P.S. Case No.420 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 329(4), 303(2), 74, 352 and 351(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of three cases and petitioner no.2 has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons including the petitioners came variously armed and started abusing and on objection Swarath assaulted the informant by an iron rod causing injury on head, thereafter Dinesh (Petitioner No.2) acted inappropriately with his bhabhi and assaulted her with bamboo causing injury on head and Ranjeet (Petitioner No.1) assaulted his brother, namely, Manoj by rod causing injury on



head.

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 on account of dispute relating to land, an altercation took place, in which, both side assaulted each other. It is further submitted that specific allegation of assaulting the informant is against Swarath and petitioner no.1 is alleged to have assaulted Manoj, the brother of the informant by rod causing injury on head, while petitioner no.2 is alleged to have assaulted bhabhi of the informant by bamboo. It is next submitted that injury suffered by Manoj has been opined to be simple in nature and as far as petitioner no.2 is concerned, he has been implicated only with an intent to give seriousness to the case that he assaulted a woman. It is further submitted that Dayanand Yadav along with Amit, Arvind, Raju and Bishundeo had approached this court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.18369 of 2026 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 01.04.2026, thus based on parity, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that from perusal of the order dated 01.04.2026 in Cr. Misc. No.18369 of 2026, it would manifest that no specific allegation of assault was



alleged against the petitioners of the said case but as far as petitioners in the instant case are concerned, petitioner no.1 is alleged to have assaulted Manoj by rod, causing injury and petitioner no.2 is alleged to have acted inappropriately with Ravita and also assaulted her with bamboo causing injury on head, as recorded in the order impugned but then it is fairly submitted that the injuries have been opined to be simple in nature. Learned APP next submits that Ranjeet has antecedent of three cases and Dinesh is alleged to have assaulted a woman, as such their case is not on a similar footing with respect to petitioners of Cr. Misc. No.18369 of 2026.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into submissions of the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

