

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge - I, Darbhanga
Present : Neeraj Kumar - II, BHJS, BR00552
ABP No. 774/2026
(Arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 16/2026)
Raju Yadav Versus the State of Bihar

Raju Yadav, Aged about 24 years, S/o Bindev Yadav, R/o Village - Balha, P.S. - Keoti,
District - Darbhanga

----- Petitioner

versus

State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

Appearance(s):

Counsel for the Petitioner(s)	: Sri Anil Kumar Jha, Learned Advocate.
Counsel for the State	: Sri A. N. Jha, Learned Public Prosecutor.
Counsel for the Informant	: Sri Kamal Narayan Pandey, Learned Advocate.

ORDER

20.05.2026

1. The petitioner above named sought anticipatory bail in connection with Mahila P.S. Case No 16/2026 registered for the offences under Section 69, 115(2), 351(2), 352, 318(4), 89, 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita (hereinafter referred to as 'BNS' for short).
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that he was innocent and had not committed any offence. It was further submitted that petitioner had not filed bail petition of any sort earlier this court or either before any superior court. It was further submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It was also submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case only to put pressure upon him. It was also submitted that all the sections are bailable and the petitioner has not committed any criminal breach of trust rioting and rioting armed with dishonestly inducing for purpose of rioting and as such section 69, 89, 318(4) of BNS are not attracted against this petitioner. It was further alleged that the petitioner has been implicated in this case due to village party politics and enmity. It was also submitted that the whole case is false as it would be evident that prior to registration of FIR the petitioner has been arrested. The learned counsel submitted that the instant petition was filed with the affidavit of the prosecutrix herself and the petitioner and the prosecutrix got married. It was submitted that the petitioner was ready to abide by the condition(s) imposed upon him by the learned court. The learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.
3. The learned private counsel of the informant supported the factum of the compromise and the marriage between the prosecutrix and the petitioner. The learned counsel expressed no objection in granting bail to this petitioner. Also heard the learned PP.
4. Heard both the sides, perused the case record and the case diary.
5. The allegation against the petitioner is that he sexually exploited the prosecutrix in the pretext of marrying her. When she became pregnant she was administered some

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge - I, Darbhanga
Present : Neeraj Kumar - II, BHJS, BR00552
ABP No. 774/2026
(Arising out of Mahila P.S. Case No. 16/2026)
Raju Yadav Versus the State of Bihar

medication which made her sick. It is alleged that the petitioner kept her at some house, continuously sexually exploited her, made her obscene video and evicted her out of the house threatening to make video viral if she would complain anywhere. It is alleged that the prosecutrix golden jewellery was misappropriated by the petitioner to purchase land.

6. The prosecutrix appeared personally before the court and supported the factum of marriage with the petitioner. She also expressed no objection in granting bail to the petitioner. A noting to this effect is also made by the prosecutrix in the margin of the order sheet. It is more than obvious that the instant petition is filed with the affidavit of the prosecutrix.
7. In the facts and circumstances as discussed above, the instant anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner namely **Raju Yadav** is hereby **allowed**. In the event of arrest or surrender by the petitioner within 21 (Twenty One) days of receipt/production of this order, he is directed to be released on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Learned Jurisdictional Court concerned with an undertaking as stipulated under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.
8. It is made clear that this order has no bearing on the merits of the case.
9. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned Jurisdictional Court.
10. Let this case record be deposited in the Record Room, Civil Court, Darbhanga after all due diligence.

(Neeraj Kumar - II)
Addl. Sessions Judge-I
Darbhanga
20.05.2026

Date of Order	20.05.2026
Date of Reserving Order	20.05.2026
Uploading Date	20.05.2026
Uploaded by	Pushkar (Stenographer)