

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21156 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-507 Year-2025 Thana- ALOULI District- Khagaria

1. Hare Ram Yadav Son of Late Domi Yadav Resident of Village- Bhikhari Ghat, P.S.- Alaouli, District- Khagaria
2. Pradip Yadav Son of Late Domi Yadav Resident of Village- Bhikhari Ghat, P.S.- Alaouli, District- Khagaria
3. Vikas Kumar Son of Sushil Yadav Resident of Village- Bhikhari Ghat, P.S.- Alaouli, District- Khagaria
4. Dilkhush Kumar Son of Rajdip Yadav Resident of Village- Bhikhari Ghat, P.S.- Alaouli, District- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Renuka Ratnakar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 08-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Alouli P.S. Case No.507 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 303(2), 351(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1, 2, 3 have antecedent of one case and petitioner no.4 is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the land in dispute measuring 18 katha is registered in the



name of her parental father-in-law, Badri Gope, further she along with her brother-in-law Girish were preparing paddy, when 8 accused persons including the petitioners came and Hareram fired causing firearm injury to Girish on his left leg, thereafter Pradeep assaulted him by an iron rod causing injury on head, further Sushil and Dilkhush assaulted Pintu by an iron rod causing injury and doctor disclosed that Pintu suffered brain haemorrhage, while Vikash and Nitish assaulted causing fracture of both hands of the informant and Dilkhush along with Sushil snatched ear-ring of her sister-in-law and accused assaulted her sister-in-law also.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land. It is next submitted that no doubt it is alleged that Harearm fired causing firearm injury to Girish but then from perusal of the injury report, it would manifest that the injury suffered by Girish has been opined to be simple in nature caused by hard and blunt substance hence allegation of firing stands belied. It is further submitted that Sushil and Dilkhush are alleged to have assaulted Pintu by iron rod causing injury but then the FIR does not disclose that on which part of the



body Pintu suffered injury and Vikash along with Nitish are alleged to have assaulted the informant causing injury on hand and the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature but then from perusal of the injury report of the informant, it would manifest that the same records lacerated wound on right wrist, swelling, abrasion on left hand and pain on left thigh, as such the injury though opined to be grievous but then was on non-vital part of the body.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that Sushil and Dilkhush are alleged to have assaulted Pintu by an iron rod causing injury and from perusal of the injury report of Pintu, it would manifest that the opinion has been reserved and the doctor has recorded that there was a midline shift of 4 mm towards right side of the fronto-parieto-occipital region, which amply demonstrates that the assault was brutal. It is further submitted that Vikash is alleged to have assaulted informant who is a woman causing grievous injury along with Nitish but then submits that Nitish and Sushil are not petitioners in the instant case but then fairly submits that though Harearm is alleged to have fired but then no firearm injury was found and the injury suffered on account of assault by Pradeep is opined to



be simple in nature.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner no.1 and 2, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Alouli P.S. Case No.507 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. However, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioner no.3 and 4.

8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of petitioner no.3 and 4 are hereby rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

