

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91374 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-153 Year-2025 Thana- ARER District- Madhubani

1. Arjun Yadav S/O Liladhar Yadav Resident of village- Sinuara (Sinwara) P.S- Arer, District- Madhubani
2. Arun Yadav @ Arunu Yadav S/O Liladhar Yadav Resident of village- Sinuara (Sinwara) P.S- Arer, District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subhash Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 28-01-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Arer P.S. Case No. 153 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 76, 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the BNS.

3. Allegedly, in the evening of 06.07.2025, all the FIR named accused persons, including the petitioners, rushed to the house of the informant and started abusing. When the same was protested, it is alleged that the petitioners caught hold the hair of the informant and brought her on road and started misbehaving. In the meanwhile, when the husband of the informant came to her rescue, he was brutally assaulted by the petitioners by means



of iron rod and *farsa* due to which he sustained serious injuries. There is further allegation of snatching of valuables against other accused persons.

4.Learned Advocate for the petitioners submitted that the alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 06.07.2025 but the present FIR came to be instituted on 10.07.2025 and the delay has not been explained. In fact, prior to the alleged occurrence, the petitioner No. 1 had instituted Arer P.S. Case No. 148 of 2025 on 07.07.2025 itself against the informant and her family members. The present case is nothing but a counter blast to the afore noted case in order to save the skin and put pressure. The injuries which are allegedly sustained to the husband of the informant are concerned, the same have been found to be simple in nature, except the injury which has been found over the wrist of the informant's husband, the opinion of which is awaiting on account of X-ray report. It is further contended that there is previous enmity, which led to false implication of the petitioners. Petitioner No. 2 is a man of fair antecedent and petitioner No. 1 bears one criminal antecedent, however he is on bail in the said case.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that the



petitioners have actively participated in the crime and brutally assaulted the husband of the informant.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned Advocates for the respective parties and taking note of the factum of case and counter case, besides the nature of injury as well as the delay in lodging of the present FIR, let the petitioners abovenamed be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned SDJM, Benipatti, Madhubani in connection with Arer P.S. Case No. 153 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, with the further condition that one of the bailors shall be the own/close family members of the petitioners.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-

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

