

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69632 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-195 Year-2024 Thana- KHARIK District- Bhagalpur

Dilip Yadav S/o Late Buchchi Yadav R/o vill - Lattipur, P.s. - Bihpur, Distt.-
Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ganesh Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Kharik P.S. Case No.195/2024, registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 308(2), 308(5),
303(2), 109, 352 of the B.N.S., 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms
Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of seven cases but then petitioner was
acquitted in six cases and the informant alleges that a group of
armed criminals committed loot in multiple shops at Lattipur
crossing, including that in the shop of the informant and
terrorized the area by firing 20-25 rounds and also threatened
the shopkeepers to pay extortion money of Rs.10,000/- each or



face arson.

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 allegation against the petitioner is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that since petitioner has antecedent, as such he came to be implicated. earlier also in similar manner, petitioner was implicated. It is next submitted that petitioner is not a criminal and similarly situated co-accused Prabhu Yadav was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by an order dated 25.07.2025 by a learned Coordinate Bench.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner was implicated in seven cases and allegation is of committing loot in the shop of the informant and persons similarly situated and allegation of firing is also there for terrorizing the shopkeepers. It is further submitted that petitioner is named in the FIR and investigation in the case is continuing and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused Bindeshwari Yadav had approached this Court seeking



anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 66648 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 10.02.2026, on which, the learned APP submits that the case of the petitioner is not akin to the case of Bindeshwari Yadav.

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

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

