

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18715 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-335 Year-2019 Thana- JHAJHA District- Jamui

Mantu Yadav @ Mantu Kumar Yadav S/o Mohan Yadav R/o Village - Bela
Tanr, Tola Rajla Kalan, P.S - Jhajha, District - Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148,
149, 447, 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that accused persons including the petitioner came on
11.11.2019 at about 11:30 PM and asked to open the door,
accordingly, his minor son aged about 15 years opened the door,
when he was dragged outside the house and Sajan along with
Prem caught his legs while Ganesh and Rohan caught his hands
and Nandu sat on his chest and slit his neck by *dabia* and
thereafter ran behind the informant carrying arms, but fled when



villagers gathered on alarm, further petitioner was carrying bomb in a bag.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that specific allegation of slitting the neck of the minor son of the informant is against Nandu and as far as this petitioner is concerned, against him it is alleged that he was carrying bomb in a bag, but then the bomb was not used. It is further submitted that Karu Yadav had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 26604 of 2023 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 14.07.2023 passed by a learned Co-ordinate Bench, thus, the learned counsel based on parity seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioner also, on the ground that like Karu Yadav, no specific allegation of assault is alleged against the petitioner.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case and the case was instituted in the year 2019 and petitioner in the year 2026 for the first time approached the learned District Court seeking anticipatory bail



and after the anticipatory bail application was rejected, thereafter the petitioner moved before this Court. It is also submitted that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that minor son of the informant was killed and it is specifically alleged that petitioner was also present at the place of occurrence with bomb, it is fairly submitted that though bomb was not used, but then the same was a threat which desisted the informant and others from helping his son against the accused. It is further submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, he may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

