

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15331 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-416 Year-2024 Thana- CHANDAUTI District- Gaya

Deepak Yadav @ Deepak Kumar @ Deepak Kumar Yadav S/O Ajay Yadav
R/O Village- Kandi, P.S.- Chandauti, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Sinha, Advocate Ms. Anjali Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Nand Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 11-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Chandauti P.S. Case No. 416 of 2024, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 190, 191(2), 115(2), 126(2), 127(2), 109, 117(2), 74, 303(2), 351(2) and 352 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. Earlier, anticipatory bail of the petitioner has been rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 01.12.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 76580 of 2025.

4. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner along with other accused persons has assaulted the informant and his family members by various means.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submitted that the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been arrested only on the basis of suspicion. It is further submitted that there is case and counter case between the parties. The petitioner is in custody since 20.01.2026 and has got one criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 28.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 13264 of 2025.

6. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner and other accused persons have assaulted the informant repeatedly by iron rod causing injury on his head. It is further submitted that the informant has received three injuries out of which two injuries were on head and the third injury was pain and swelling in left hand and the injuries have been opined to be grievous in nature. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail.



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

8. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioner will have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

