

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22319 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-364 Year-2025 Thana- MAIRWAN District- Siwan

Yogendra Chaudhary @ Yogendra Yadav S/o Late Ramayan Chaudhary
Resident of Village- Ghanshyam Mathia, Nawka Tola, P.S.- Mairwa, District-
Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Arbind Kumar Singh, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s :	Ms.Nirmala Kumari, APP
	Mr. Md. Danish Quamar, Advocate
	Ms. Madiha Moneer, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Mairwa PS Case No. 364 of 2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 308(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that dreaded criminal Jeevan Yadav called him from
mobile No. 8757461228 on his mobile No. 9431272900 and
demanded extortion of Rs. 10 lakh and threatened that if extortion
is not paid, his land would be captured and family killed, further
on 28-8-2025 Jeevan along with petitioner and two named accused



came on his land and destroyed his maize crop worth Rs. 20,000/- and destroyed the boundary wall and committed theft of pumping set.

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 informant has filed a compromise petition before the learned trial court based on which Jeevan was granted bail on surrender and the case of the petitioner is on better footing.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that Jeevan Yadav is a dreaded criminal who has more than 10 cases against him. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant had specifically alleged against Jeevan, petitioner and two others, but then during the course of investigation the mobile from which the extortion call came, it transpired that the same belong to one Gama with whom Jeevan has no connection. It is also submitted that Jeevan had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail, but then the same came to be rejected, thereafter he surrendered before the learned trial court and based on a compromise he was released. It is next submitted that from perusal of the order by which the bail was granted to Jeevan, it would manifest that the same records that



informant was present in the court and he said that the person who has surrendered is not the person against whom the FIR is instituted, it is also submitted that this amply demonstrates that how informant was coerced into submission to enter into a compromise by a criminal. It is next submitted that informant specifically alleged against Jeevan, petitioner and two others, but under fear the compromise was filed. It is further submitted that informant has not compromised with the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that no compromise has been entered in between the petitioner and the informant.

7. Considering the submission made by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

