

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49747 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2026 Thana- MANSI District- Khagaria

Abhimanyu Yadav @ Abhimanyu Prasad @ Abhimanyu Kumar Yadav son of
Dileshwar yadav Resident of village- Nonha, Ward no. 09, Ps- Mansi, Dist-
Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 29-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Mansi P.S. Case No.17 of 2026, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 109 of the
B.N.S., 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26(2), 27, 35 of the Arms
Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of three cases and the informant
alleges that 21.01.2026 at 3.50 P.M. he received secret
information that Amar along with his associates are planning to
commit crime, accordingly, the police force reached the place of
occurrence where accused persons had gathered, but accused



persons fled but Dileshwar was apprehended and from the place of occurrence two regular rifles along with cartridges both live and misfired were recovered as detailed in the FIR, the apprehended accused disclosed the name of petitioner along with other accused persons, who fled.

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 petitioner was not apprehended from the spot and he came to be implicated based on confessional statement of Dileshwar in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that he received secret information that Amar along with his associates have gathered and are planning to commit crime, accordingly the force reached the place of occurrence, where Dileshwar was apprehended and other accused persons fled and from the place of occurrence, arms and ammunition were recovered. It is also submitted that no doubt name of the



petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended accused which does not have any evidentiary value but then in the nature of allegation and the fact that petitioner has antecedent of three cases, if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence, as the investigation is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

