

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37890 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-564 Year-2025 Thana- JHAJHA District- Jamui

Rajesh Yadav @ Rajesh Kumar son of Gopal Yadav Resident of Vill-
Kauwatol, PS-Jhajha, District -Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Sharda Nand Mishra, Adv
Ms. Isha Mishra, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kanhiya Kishor

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Jhajha P.S. Case No. 564 of 2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109 and
118(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case but then the said case was
instituted by the wife of the informant and the informant alleges
that accused persons including the petitioner came to his house
on 27-11-2025 at 2 pm, and petitioner assaulted his son who was
playing by tangi causing injury on head, earlier petitioner had
assaulted his wife and the injured was taken to the hospital.



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 petitioner and the informant are related. It is further submitted that they are having dispute relating to property as such the instant false case came to be instituted. It is also submitted that initially the injury of the injured was reserved but supplementary injury report was issued and the same recorded -- the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that FIR has been instituted by the father of the victim and petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the victim, who is a toddler by tangi causing injury on head which is vital part of the body. It is next submitted that allegation is of assaulting an infant and the blow could have resulted in serious injury. It is thus submitted that it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail despite injury being simple in nature.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

