IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76671 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011088192026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-369 Year-2026 Thana- KAUWAKOL District- Nawada

==========

Dilip Yadav @ Dilip Kumar S/o Brahamdev Yadav R/o Village - Guaghoghra, P.S. - Kawakole, Dist. - Nawada. ... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shankar Kumar, Adv
For the State : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Ranjit Kumar Thakur, Adv

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

2 04-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Kawakole P.S. Case No. 369 of 2026, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, as per the informant is that on 16.07.2026 at about 3:30 PM, Brahmdev Yadav visited the CSP of Bihar Gramin Bank to withdraw money. As the server was down, he was asked to wait. On being informed that the withdrawal was not possible at that time, he abused the informant and called his sons, Dilip Yadav and Sachin Yadav, who arrived armed with iron rods and assaulted the informant on his head, causing injuries. Thereafter, the accused persons forcibly took away Rs. 1,43,600/- from the

WEB COPY

informant and threatened to kill him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner and the informant are neighbour and having some dispute between them, scuffle took place. There is a delay of three days in lodging the FIR and the petitioner has three criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant oppose the prayer of anticipatory bail.

6. From reading of the allegations levelled in the FIR, it is clear that the petitioner is the main assailant, who is said to have assaulted the informant with iron rod on his head which led to head injury, a vital part of the body. The petitioner also bears three criminal antecedent. Considering the seriousness of the allegation and the fact that the petitioner is main assailant, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

kiran/-

U		T	

WEB COPY