

Page No. 1 of 3
Santosh Kumar Pandey, D&ASJ – II, Darbhanga
ABP No. 592/2026
(Arising out of Manigachhi P. S. Case No. 35/2026)
Raman Ji Kumar Yadav versus the State of Bihar.
Date of Order – 20.05.2026

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-II, DARBHANGA
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 592/2026

1. Raman Ji Kumar Yadav s/o Mohan Yadav, resident of Village - Laho, P.S. -
Manigachhi, District - Darbhanga ----- Petitioner

versus

State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

Appearance(s):

Counsel for the Petitioner(s) : Sri Chandra Kant Kumar, Learned Advocate.

Counsel for the State : Sri A. N. Jha, Learned Public Prosecutor.

ORDER
20.05.2026

1. The present application has been preferred on behalf of the petitioner seeking the privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Manigachhi P.S. Case No. 35 of 2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 352, 109(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as “BNS”).
2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 25.01.2026 at about 08:30 AM, when the Informant had stopped near Jagganath Petrol Pump at a tea stall, the accused persons namely Saroj Yadav, Raman Ji Yadav (present petitioner) and Munnu Thakur allegedly arrived there, abused the Informant and thereafter assaulted him by means of dagger causing injuries over his left chest, left hand and left thigh. It is further alleged that the Informant was initially taken to PHC, Manigachhi and thereafter referred to DMCH, Darbhanga for better treatment, on the basis of which the present FIR came to be instituted.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated due to previous enmity. It has further been contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and that no specific overt act distinguishing the role of the present petitioner from that of the co-accused has been attributed in the FIR. It has also been argued that despite lapse of considerable time, the prosecution has failed to bring the injury report on record and, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted.

Page No. 2 of 3
Santosh Kumar Pandey, D&ASJ – II, Darbhanga
ABP No. 592/2026
(Arising out of Manigachhi P. S. Case No. 35/2026)
Raman Ji Kumar Yadav versus the State of Bihar.
Date of Order – 20.05.2026

4. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and relate to assault by dangerous weapon. It has further been submitted that notice under Section 94 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 had already been issued by the Investigating Officer to the Medical Officer concerned for production of injury report, however, the same has not yet been received.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the materials available on record including the case diary. From the allegations made in the FIR, it transpires that the accusation against the petitioner is of participating in the alleged assault along with other accused persons. However, at this stage, the prosecution has not been able to place the injury report on record in support of the nature, extent or gravity of the injuries allegedly sustained by the Informant. The case diary further reveals that despite issuance of notice by the Investigating Officer under Section 94 BNSS as well as communication made by this Court vide Letter No. 145 dated 07.05.2026 addressed to the Superintendent, DMCH, Darbhanga, the injury report has not been received till date. In the present case, though allegations of assault have been levelled against the petitioner, yet the precise nature of injuries allegedly caused to the Informant has not been substantiated by any medical document till date. The anticipatory bail petition has remained pending since 10.04.2026 solely for want of injury report and this Court cannot keep the matter pending indefinitely in absence of cooperation from the concerned medical authority. Moreover, there is nothing on record to indicate that the petitioner has criminal antecedent or that he is likely to abscond or tamper with the evidence if protected by anticipatory bail.
6. At the stage of consideration of anticipatory bail, a meticulous examination of evidence is not required and the Court is only to ascertain whether custodial interrogation appears necessary in the facts and circumstances of the case. In the considered opinion of this Court, having regard to the absence of injury report, the nature of allegations, the omnibus nature of accusation, and the clean antecedent of the petitioner, custodial detention of the petitioner does not appear necessary for the purpose of investigation.

Page No. 3 of 3
Santosh Kumar Pandey, D&ASJ – II, Darbhanga
ABP No. 592/2026
(Arising out of Manigachhi P. S. Case No. 35/2026)
Raman Ji Kumar Yadav versus the State of Bihar.
Date of Order – 20.05.2026

7. Accordingly, considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has succeeded in making out a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.
8. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is **allowed**.
9. It is directed that in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from the date of this order, the petitioner shall be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Santosh Kumar Pandey)
Additional Sessions Judge-II
Darbhanga
20.05.2026

Date of Judgement/order	20.05.2026
Date of reserving judgement/order	20.05.2026
Uploading Date	21.05.2026
Uploaded by	Ashish Kumar, Stenographer.