

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44303 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2026 Thana- MALAHI District- East Champaran

Anirudh Yadav Son of Late Ghoor Yadav @ Indradev Yadav R/O- Majhariya,
P.S.- Malahi, Distt.- East Champaran at Motihari.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashank Shekhar

For the Opposite Party/s : Shri Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Shri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 27.02.2026 at 7:00 a.m. eleven named accused persons including the petitioner on account of dispute relating to land came and started abusing the informant, on objection, Sagar and Jitan dashed her on the ground and assaulted by fist and leg on chest and back, on alarm her son Bittu came who was assaulted by Dharmendra, Anand and Pannalal, who were carrying rod, causing injury on head, thereafter Anirudh (petitioner) and Mukesh assaulted Ramavatar by lathi causing injury on head, chest and back, further Ramchandra assaulted Rampukar by rod causing fracture of right hand while Manisha



and Priti snatched her chain.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant on account of dispute relating to land, it is next submitted that specific allegation of assaulting Bittu is against Dharmendra, Anand and Pannalal and petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted Bittu who died subsequently during the course of treatment, it is also submitted that petitioner is a senior citizen aged about 65 years and has remained a person with clean antecedent all throughout but then he along with entire family came to be implicated on account of land dispute.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner and submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that the son of the informant died, it is also submitted that informant specifically alleges that petitioner along with Mukesh assaulted Ramavatar by lathi causing injury on head, chest and back but then fairly submits that petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted the deceased, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR it would manifest that though petitioner is not alleged to have assaulted the deceased



but then he was present at the place of occurrence and son of the informant on account of assault by named accused persons died on account of craniocerebral injury, it is thus submitted that petitioner instead of ensuring that the dispute be resolved amicably is alleged to have assaulted another family member of the informant, this perhaps emboldened the accused persons who assaulted the deceased, it is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail.

6. Hence, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

