

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44374 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-28 Year-2026 Thana- TANKUPPA District- Gaya

=====

Pappu Yadav @ Pappu Kumar S/O Krishna Prasad Yadav @ Krishna Yadav
R/o Vill.- Kharauna, PS- Tankuppa, Dist.- Gaya Jee

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Priya Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Nath Jha

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 21-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 74, 329(4), 117(2), 109, 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that on 26.01.2026 at 6:30 P.M. petitioner along with seven named accused persons came to his house and started abusing, on objection, started assaulting by rod causing injury on head, thereafter petitioner dashed his wife (Gudiya) on ground and assaulted her by rod causing injury on head and accused persons



also assaulted his family members and reason for the occurrence is that informant side had requested to the side of the petitioner earlier not to talk inappropriately near their house.

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 further submitted that from side of the petitioner, Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 30 of 2026 was instituted against the informant and his side, it is also submitted that on the date of the occurrence, an altercation had taken place in which both side assaulted each other and from the side of the petitioner also people received multiple injury as would manifest from the injury report annexed as Annexure 3 to the anticipatory bail application.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant vehemently oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned A.P.P. submits that even if there was any dispute in between the informant and the side of the petitioner, in that event the petitioner could not have assaulted a woman on head by a rod causing injury on head, on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the injury suffered by Gudiya has been opined to be simple in nature, on which



learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that Gudiya received injury on head and swelling on elbow, though injury has been opined to be simple but then is on the vital part of the body and is caused by the petitioner.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and also the fact that petitioner assaulted a woman on vital part of the body i.e. head and has antecedent of two cases, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikram/-

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

