

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.87824 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-342 Year-2025 Thana- PAKARIBARAW District- Nawada

1. Indradev Yadav Son of Munsu Yadav Resident of Village - Datroul, P.S. - Pakriwarwan, Distt. - Nawada.
2. Chandrika Yadav Son of Munsu Yadav Resident of Village - Datroul, P.S. - Pakriwarwan, Distt. - Nawada.
3. Amirak Yadav Son of Munsu Yadav Resident of Village - Datroul, P.S. - Pakriwarwan, Distt. - Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Amit Ranjan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 303(2), 351(2), 3(5) and 352(2) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners no. 1 and 2 are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 3 has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges that accused persons came and started abusing and enquired about her father-in-law. On objection by her mother-in-law not to abuse her husband, Chandrika Yadav (petitioner no. 2) assaulted her by rod causing injury on head and thereafter



Indradev Yadav (petitioner no. 1) and Amirak Yadav (petitioner no. 3) assaulted the informant by Khanti causing injury on head and hand. Further, Dinesh, Vikash and Ajit assaulted her brother-in-law causing injury on head and hand and other accused assaulted her sister-in-law causing injury on hand and body and also assaulted her the other son-in-law.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners and the informant are agnates and are having dispute relating to property. It is further submitted that on account of dispute relating to property, an altercation took place in which both sides assaulted each other. It is next submitted that no doubt, mother-in-law of the informant, namely, Surji Devi and sister-in-law, namely, Sunita Devi suffered grievous injury but then the injury suffered by them are on non-vital part of the body, i.e., hand, though in the FIR, it is alleged that Chandrika Yadav assaulted Surji Devi by rod causing injury on head but then Surji Devi did not suffer any injury on head. It is further submitted that the Doctor with regard to the injury of others has opined the injury to be simple in nature. It is next submitted that allegation of assault against Indradev Yadav and Amirak Yadav is not specific and even the injury suffered on account of assault made by them to the informant has been opined to be simple in



nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners but then fairly submits after perusing the case diary that the injury suffered by Surji Devi and Sunita Devi has been opined to be grievous but then are on non-vital part of the body and rest of the injured have suffered simple injury.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, let the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each 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 Pakriwrawan P.S. Case No. 342 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

