

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38767 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-247 Year-2025 Thana- GOVINDPUR District- Nawada

Jay Prakash Yadav @ Jay Prakash Kumar S/O Late Raj Kumar Yadav R/O
Village - Bishanpur, P.S- Govindpur, Distt.- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Navin Kr. Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Bhavesh Kumar, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 31-07-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and apprehending his arrest in connection with Govindpur P.S. Case No.247/2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 74, 76, 118(1), 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. The allegation against petitioner is to assault informant and others during the course of occurrence causing head and bodily injuries having intention to cause their death, where occurrence arises out of drainage issues.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that present occurrence appears free fight in nature, where both parties received injuries, therefore, it cannot be said that petitioner was under intention to cause death of the injured informant and other injured persons. It is also submitted that petitioner's side also lodged a case for the same set of occurrence, which has been



registered as Govindpur P.S. Case No.246/2026. It is submitted that injury as alleged to be caused by this petitioner is on the non-vital party of the body. Petitioner claimed clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP duly assisted by learned counsel for the informant while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that petitioner specifically alleged to assault informant injured namely, Umesh Prasad during the course of occurrence by using iron rod, which is apparent from the CCTV footage and also upon medical examination *border of scapula bone found fractured*, which was opined as “grievous injury”.

6. In view of aforesaid factual submission and by taking note of fact as specific allegation to cause “grievous injury” upon informant is available against this petitioner, accordingly prayer of anticipatory bail of petitioner stands rejected.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

S.Tripathi/-

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

