

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39935 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2026 Thana- VIJAYEPUR District- Gopalganj

Baiju Yadav @ Baijhnath Yadav Son of Ramchandra Yadav Resident of
Village- Kapardhika, P.S.- Kateya, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhuresh Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 118(1), 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he along with his uncle Anil were coming back
home from the market on motorcycle when they were
intercepted by the accused persons including the petitioner near
Bakaniya Crossing and petitioner caught his uncle and Raju
stabbed him causing injury on stomach and thereafter Raju also
assaulted the informant by knife who tried to save his uncle
causing injury on stomach.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that even presuming what has been alleged is true without admitting then the petitioner is not alleged to have stabbed Anil and the informant, rather specific allegation of stabbing the injured is against Raju.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that no doubt, specific allegation of stabbing Anil and the informant is against Raju but then petitioner is alleged to have caught Anil and his presence at the place of occurrence emboldened Raju to commit the occurrence of stabbing and the investigation of the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Vijaipur P.S. Case No. 36 of 2026 pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-VI, Gopalganj/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

