

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43258 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-74 Year-2026 Thana- JAGDISHPUR District- Bhojpur

Lallu Yadav @ Samrat @ Lallu Samarath S/O Dara Yadav R/O Vill.-
Anharubagh, P.S.- Tiyar, Dist.- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Malti Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-07-2026 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 191(2),
191(3), 115(2), 308(2), 303(2), 324(4), 352, 351(2) of the BNS,
2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of nine case and the informant alleges
that a truck was parked outside her shop for unloading a
machine, when two unknown accused came and started
demanding Rs. 5,000/- from the truck driver, when her son
intervened, thereafter 15-20 unknown accused with two middle
aged accused came to her shop and vandalized the shop and
Ranjan took Rs. 70,000/- from the counter and the petitioner



fired outside the shop and snatched her chain.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that the date of occurrence is 23.02.2026 and the FIR came to be instituted on 24.02.2026, it is also submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation of vandalizing the shop of the petitioner and taking Rs. 70,000/- is not alleged against the petitioner, but then it is alleged that petitioner fired and snatched her chain which is an ornamental allegation.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that petitioner has antecedent of nine cases, it is further submitted that if informant had any intention of falsely implicating the petitioner, in that event she could have roped the petitioner with serious allegation, but then allegation against the petitioner is of snatching her chain and firing outside the shop for creating terror.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is in agreement with the submission made by the learned A.P.P. for the State and also taking into consideration the



criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined
to extend of privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. This application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

