

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35501 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-112 Year-2025 Thana- Bahoranpur District- Bhojpur

Raj Kumar Yadav Son of Devi Dayal Yadav Resident of Village- Charghat,
P.S.- Bahoranpur, District- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Usha Kumari Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 21-05-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Bahoranpur P.S. Case No.112 of 2025, for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 303(2), 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that on the date of occurrence, while he was standing near his house, then the petitioner came there and altercation took place between the parties, upon which the petitioner is set to have assaulted on the head of the informant with a brick, due to which he sustained injuries on his head. It is further alleged that when the elder brother of the informant, namely, Suraj



Kumar Yadav came to save him then the petitioner assaulted him with a knife. It is further alleged that co-accused, Arti Devi assaulted the informant and his brother with a brick and the petitioner also snatched the locket of the informant made of gold.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the entire allegations levelled against the petitioner are false and fabricated. The petitioner is working at Kolkata. She further submits that the petitioner and the informant are full brothers and there is a land dispute in between the parties, which also appears from the First Informant Report itself. The petitioner also filed a complaint case, bearing Complaint Case No. 1677 (C)/2025 before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bhojpur at Ara, wherein the informant and others have been made accused. It is further submitted that there was a free fight in between the parties and both the sides suffered injuries. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that from the injury report, it appears that the doctor found the injuries to be simple in nature.

5. *Per Contra*, the learned APP for the state opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submits that the petitioner does not deserve privilege of



anticipatory bail and he has caused injuries on the head of the informant.

6. Having heard the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that the petitioner and the informant are full brothers and there is dispute in between them for which the informant has filed the present case and the petitioner has filed a complaint case. Further, the petitioner has got a clean antecedent and the learned VIIIth Additional Sessions Judge, Bhojpur at Ara, while rejecting the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner, has recorded about the injuries sustained by the informant and his brother and he has recorded that the doctor found the injuries to be simple in nature.

7. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Ara in connection with Bahoranpur P.S. Case No.112 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. with a further condition that:-

The learned court concerned shall verify the criminal



antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bond in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/Shital

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

