

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80511 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-560 Year-2024 Thana- BARACHATTI District- Gaya

1. Piyush Yadav @ Ghanshyam Yadav Son of Nakku Yadav @ Nanhku Yadav R/o Village - Bela, P.S. - Dhangai (Barachatti), Dist. - Gaya.
2. Rangu Yadav @ Rangu Kumar Son of Dinesh Yadav R/o Village - Mahuain, P.S. - Dhangai (Barachatti), Dist. - Gaya.
3. Uday Yadav Son of Ishwar Yadav R/o Village - Mushahra, Bela, P.S. - Dhangai (Barachatti), Dist. - Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, A,P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-02-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at this stage, seeks permission to make rectification at para 3 of the anticipatory bail application as it has been submitted that inadvertently at para 3 it has been pleaded that petitioner no. 2 has got two criminal antecedent when it ought to have been petitioner no. 3 and petitioner no. 3 has got five criminal antecedent when it ought to have been petitioner no.2.

3. Permission is accorded.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners, after arguing vehemently for sometimes realizing his difficulty, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to



petitioner no. 2 and 3, namely, Rangu Yadav @ Rangu Kumar and Uday Yadav.

5. Permission is accorded.

6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed as withdrawn with respect to petitioner no. 2 and 3.

7. It is made clear that if petitioner no. 2 and 3 surrender and seek regular bail, the learned trial court shall consider the case on its own merit without being prejudiced by the fact that petitioner no. 2 and 3 before this Court withdrew their anticipatory bail application.

8. The petitioner no. 1 apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115, 109, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner no. 1 submits that petitioner no. 1 is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on account of prevailing political dispute, the accused persons including the petitioner no. 1 came on 24.12.2024 and abused Sanjay, Ajay and Vikash, thereafter, Mundrika fired 4-5 rounds at the gate of the informant and thereafter the accused persons dashed her on the ground and when she disclosed that Sanjay, Ajay and Vikash are not at home, the accused persons left threatening that Sanjay and Vikash would be killed.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner no. 1 submits that petitioner no. 1 has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that allegation against the petitioner no. 1 is general and omnibus in nature and only to give seriousness to the case, it is alleged that 4-5 rounds was fired in the air when no one was injured.

11. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner no. 1.

12. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner no. 1 and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner no. 1 is a person with clean antecedent, let the petitioner no. 1 above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Barachatti P.S. Case No. 560 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

