IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75869 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011092512026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2026 Thana- KARJAIN District- Supaul

==========

Vijay Kumar Bharti @ Vijay Yadav Son of Dhanpat Yadav Resident of village - Dhudhari, Ward No. 03, P.S.- Karjain, District - Supaul.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Murari Narain Chaudhary, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 132, 121(1), 263, 109, 76, 324(4), 303(2), 352, 351(1) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant alleges that on 30.05.2026, the police force reached the house of the petitioner and arrested him in connection with Karjain PS Case Non 63 of 2026, when named accused persons including the petitioner attacked the police force. It is also alleged that petitioner started strangulating the informant, hence she felt

WEB COPY

weak and accused persons managed to free the petitioner and even manhandled the women constables.

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 side of the petitioner Karjain PS Case No. 65 of 2026 was instituted against the neighbor and the police instead of taking action on the FIR instituted by the side of the petitioner came to arrest the petitioner with respect to the aforesaid case which was instituted by the side of the accused of Karjain PS Case No. 65 of 2026.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and the informant is a police officer and specifically alleges that petitioner was apprehended but the named accused persons attacked the police force and taking advantage of the same, the petitioner started strangulating her on account of which she felt weak and the accused persons managed to free the petitioner. It is next submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

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

WEB COPY

anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. **Accordingly, the application stands rejected.**

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY