

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40666 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-100 Year-2025 Thana- NAYA RAM NAGAR District- Munger

Sanoj Kumar @ Sanoj Yadav S/o Ram Bilash Yadav R/o Village -
Kalarampur, P.S.- Nayaram Nagar, District - Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jyoti Ranjan Jha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umesh Lal Verma, APP
For the Informant : Ms. Nidhi Suman, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 74, 109, 303(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 07.11.2025 on her land, pillar was being erected by Sanoj (petitioner), on objection by her husband, Sanoj assaulted her husband by rod causing injury on head, further Ranjit, Bhim and Pappu assaulted her and Anshu by leg and fist while Nitish dashed her on the ground and acted inappropriately,



further the accused persons assaulted her and her husband while Pooja snatched earring of Laxmi.

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 from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is next submitted that the land in dispute belongs to the petitioner and his side and the informant and her side were trying to capture the land, as such, pillar was being erected when an altercation started in which both sides assaulted each other.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that no doubt the occurrence is alleged to have taken place on account of dispute relating to land, but then petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the husband of the informant by rod on head causing injury and head is a vital part of the body and the injury has been opined to be grievous in nature, which amply demonstrates the force used for committing the occurrence of assault.



6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

