

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78191 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-181 Year-2025 Thana- CHANDAUTI District- Gaya

Mantu Yadav @ Mantu Kumar S/O Dharmendra Yadav R/O Vill.- Kandi
Nawada, P.S.- Chandauti, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aryan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 05-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Chandauti P.S. Case No.181/2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 117(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2) and 109 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 nine cases and the informant alleges that Mantu (petitioner) called him on 19.05.2025 at 11.45 A.M., accordingly informant along with his son went to meet him, where named accused persons were also present from before, further accused persons refused to return the amount which the



informant had given for land and when his son confronted, Mantu (petitioner) fired, causing injury on mouth of his son.

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 it was the side of the informant who fired at the petitioner causing firearm injury leading to hospitalization at Jai Prakash Narayan Hospital, Gaya. It is further submitted that though informant alleges that petitioner fired causing firearm injury to the son of the informant but then the son of the informant was taken to a private hospital and his injury report was manipulated though he had not suffered any such injury.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the informant submits that from perusal of Para-5 of the order impugned, it would manifest that same records that after perusing the case record, it was found that the victim suffered firearm injury in his mouth and a lacerated wound was found at right neck with bullet and the same was removed from the neck.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



informant and also taking into consideration the fact that petitioner has antecedent of nine cases, the Court is not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

