

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38529 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2016 Thana- WARISLIGANJ District- Nawada

Girdhari Yadav S/O Late Maho Yadav @ Mahi Yadav R/O Village- Masuda,
P.S.- Warisaliganj, Distt.- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER**

2 17-06-2026 This is the second attempt made by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

3. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in connection with Warisaliganj P.S. Case No. 72 of 2016, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 448, 341, 323, 307, 324, 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was armed with Khanti and his son and daughters were armed with lathi and danda and they all assaulted the informant and thereafter even threatened her.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner had earlier moved before this Court for



grant of anticipatory bail, which was rejected but the same was prior to filing of the charge-sheet and subsequent thereto the police had submitted final form in favour of the petitioner. It has further been submitted that there was case and counter case and one Warisaliganj P.S. Case No. 73 of 2016 was lodged from the petitioner's side. It has further been submitted that despite submission of final form, the learned trial court has gone on to take cognizance against the petitioner *vide* order dated 15.03.2018. It has lastly been submitted that the parties have recently compromised and they do not want to pursue the matter any further. It has further been submitted that the injuries found to be simple in nature. Lastly, it has also been submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

6. Learned APP appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and has stated that this is the second anticipatory bail application and the same is not maintainable. It has further been submitted that the cognizance was taken in the year 2018, and still after more than six years the petitioner has approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail only after the compromise has been entered into between the parties.

7. Considering the aforesaid submissions and taking



into account the fact that the petitioner has approached this Court after more than six years of taking cognizance, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

9. However, the petitioner is at liberty to surrender and pray for regular bail which shall be considered on its own merits without being prejudiced by the rejection of the present bail application and more so taking into account the fact that the parties have compromised.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

krishna/-

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

