

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73974 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-166 Year-2025 Thana- PIPRA District- Supaul

-
1. Rahul Kumar Son of Abhinandan Yadav Resident of Village -Gopalpur Ward No.01 PS -Singheshwar Dist -Madhepura
 2. Munna Kumar @ Deepak Kumar Son of Abhinandan Yadav Resident of Village -Gopalpur Ward No.01 PS -Singheshwar Dist -Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Kamlesh Prasad Yadav, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 02-02-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioners and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 238 and 3(5) of the B.N.S..

3. As per prosecution case, informant, namely Ravindra Yadav, alleged that all the F.I.R. named accused persons, including these petitioners, killed his son. The reason for the occurrence is that the deceased had love affair with co-accused Baby Devi and all the named accused persons,



including these petitioners, who happen to be family members of Baby Devi, disliked and opposed the relationship.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. Informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence. Petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case merely on suspicion. Petitioners claim clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. and there is specific accusation that the deceased had love affair with co-accused Baby Devi and they used to frequently meet at village Gopalpur, which was not liked by the family members of co-accused Baby Devi and the accused persons also threatened the deceased and thereafter, a Panchayati was held. It is further submitted that on the date of occurrence, these petitioners were seen in the company of the deceased and thereafter, the dead body of the deceased was recovered.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, specific and direct nature of accusation, gravity of offence and materials that have surfaced during course of investigation,



the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is
rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

