

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30245 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-289 Year-2021 Thana- PIPRA District- East Champaran

Raju Prasad Yadav @ Gandhi Prasad Yadav @ Raju Kumar Yadav S/o-
Lakhindra Prasad Yadav Resident Of Village- Amwa P.S.- Turkaulia, District-
East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aditya Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. In the present case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Pipra P.S. Case No. 289 of 2021 registered for the offences under Sections 341, 323, 324, 353, 354B, 386, 379, 427/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the petitioner demanded Rs.20,000/- as extortion money from the informant and when she refused, he started throwing away the papers of the school in which the informant has been working as a teacher. When the informant opposed, the petitioner assaulted the informant and tore her clothes. When the Headmaster reached,



he was also assaulted by the petitioner with knife and the petitioner snatched the mobile phone and gold chain from the informant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case and no occurrence in the manner as alleged has ever taken place. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the person or possession of the petitioner. There is long standing dispute between the petitioner and the informant. The petitioner is a social worker and he has got clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. Learned APP submits that the specific allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has outraged the modesty of the informant and assaulted the Headmaster of the school with knife. The occurrence is of the year, 2021 and the petitioner moved before the learned Sessions Judge for anticipatory bail in the same year and his prayer for anticipatory bail was rejected and thereafter, he did not approach the court to seek bail. Learned APP further submits that the witnesses examined have supported the prosecution case.

6. Having regard to the nature of allegation and also



considering the time gap, I do not think it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

DKS/-

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

