



**COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA**  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 410/2026**  
**(Arising out of Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 322 of 2025)**

**Nitesh Kumar Yadav Three Ors**

**Petitioners**

**Versus**

**State of Bihar**

**Opp. Party**

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
04.04.2026	<p>1. This Anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of petitioners namely, 1. Nitish Kumar Yadav 2. Dinalal Yadav 3. Satyadev Ray @ Hemnarayan Yadav and 4. Dhiraj Kumar, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Ara Muffasil P.S. case no. 322/2025 u/ss. 126(2), 115(2), 190, 191(2), 191(3), 74, 303(2), 324(4), 329(4) 351(2) and 352 of BNS, put up for hearing.</p> <p>2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners Sri Bishnudhar Pandey as well as the learned P.P. Sri Rana Pratap Singh for the State.</p> <p>3. As per the case of the prosecution that Sanmato Devi is the informant of this case and on 23.11.2025 at about 10:00 PM all the FIR named accused persons armed with lathi, danda, iron rod, khanti entered into</p>	



**COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA**  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 410/2026**  
**(Arising out of Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 322 of 2025)**

Contd. 04.04.2026	<p>the house of the informant and assaulted the informant and her family members mercilessly due to which informant and her family members sustain injury on their vital parts of body and accused Dinanath Yadav tried to outrage the modesty of the informant torn her blouse and other accused persons snatched golden ornaments from the informant and her family members.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel for petitioners submitted that no bail petition of any nature has been filed or is pending on behalf of the petitioner either before this court or before the Hon'ble High Court and petitioners are man of clean antecedent. It is argued that the petitioners are innocent, have committed no offence and have been falsely implicated in this case. The informant and petitioners are co-villager and due to previous dispute informant falsely implicated the petitioner in this false case. The allegation of outraging the modesty of informant and snatching golden ornaments is general and omnibus in nature. The petitioners are man of clean antecedent and</p>	
----------------------	---	--



**COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA**  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 410/2026**  
**(Arising out of Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 322 of 2025)**

Contd. 04.04.2025	<p>they undertake to comply with any condition imposed by this court, hence, anticipatory bail petition of petitioners may be allowed.</p> <p>5. On the contrary Learned P.P. vehemently opposed the bail petition of petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in F.I.R. and there is serious allegation against them, hence anticipatory bail application should be dismissed.</p> <p>6. I have heard the rival submissions of both the parties, perused the case record. The allegations against the petitioners that they mercilessly beaten the informant and her family members and snatched golden ornaments. It appears from perusal of record that in this case three persons sustain injury out of which injured Ganesh Ray sustain grievous injury on ankle joint and other injuries of the injured persons are simple in nature. From perusal of para-40 of the case diary it reveals that petitioners given benefit u/s 35(3) of BNSS and they are cooperating in investigation. From perusal of record it also shows that non of the</p>	
----------------------	---	--



**COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA**  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 410/2026**  
**(Arising out of Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 322 of 2025)**

Contd. 04.04.2026	<p>Sections mentioned in the FIR punishable with imprisonment for more than 7 years and same is squarely covered by law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of <b>Arnesh Kumar Vrs. State of Bihar (2014)8 SCC 273</b> and <b>Satyendra Kumar Antil Vs. C.B.I. 2023(SC) 233</b>. It also appears that exaggerated and unsubstantiated allegation made against the petitioners. The petitioners are men of clean antecedent and undertake to comply with any condition as imposed by this court.</p> <p>7. Considering the fact that exaggerated and unsubstantiated allegation made against the petitioners, having clean antecedent and are undertakes to comply with any condition imposed by this Court, hence, anticipatory bail petition of the petitioners, namely 1. Nitish Kumar Yadav 2. Dinalal Yadav 3. Satyadev Ray @ Hemnarayan Yadav and 4. Dhiraj Kumar is <b>allowed</b> and it is ordered that in the event of arrest/surrender they will be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bonds of Rs.10,000/-(Ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount</p>	
----------------------	--	--



**COURT OF DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, BHOJPUR, ARA**  
**Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 410/2026**  
**(Arising out of Ara Muffasil P.S. Case No. 322 of 2025)**

Contd. 04.04.2026	<p>each to the satisfaction of the learned court below within four weeks of this order subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482 (2) BNSS and with further condition that the petitioners shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required and the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer. Any observation made herein will be inconsequential for further proceeding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Dictated &amp; corrected by me)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">sd/-</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(Purushottam Mishra) Sessions Judge. 04.04.2026</p>	