

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI

A.B.P. No. 925/2026

Arun Yadav & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar

Chandauti P.S. Case No. 235/2022

11.03.2026

Present :

For the petitioners-----: Sri Devanand Kumar, Ld. Advocate

For the State-----: Sri Sartaz Ali Khan, Ld. P.P.

The present petition for anticipatory bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioners 1. Arun Yadav 2. Geeta Devi 3. Divya Kumari @ Divya Bharti 4. Jyoti Kumari @ Jyoti Bharti 5. Sachin Kumar @ Sachin Tendulkar apprehending their arrest in connection with Chandauti P.S. Case No. 235/2022 registered for the offences punishable under sections 323, 324, 379, 504, 506 r/w 34 of the IPC.

Ld. counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were extended protection in terms of section 41(A) of the Cr.P.C. and during the course of investigation, they have fully cooperated to the IO.

Ld. counsel further submits that subsequently after submission of charge-sheet, cognizance has been taken vide order dated 19.05.2023 but no information regarding the aforesaid was given and from the order-sheet, it is discernible that for the first time, summons were issued on 24.01.2026.

Ld. counsel further contends that once they appear before the Court concerned, they may be taken into custody, they have approached this Court for grant of protection.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI

A.B.P. No. 925/2026

Arun Yadav & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar

Chandauti P.S. Case No. 235/2022

Ld. counsel further submits that on the basis of same incident two cases were got registered and this case, in fact, is a counter case of Chandauti P.S. Case No. 236/2022. He further submits that the petitioners carry no criminal antecedents.

Ld. counsel further submits that during the course of time, both the parties have settled their dispute and differences and are living in harmony. He further submits that a joint compromise application in this regard has been filed and attached with this anticipatory bail application. He further submits that all the offences are punishable with less than seven years of imprisonment, hence the prayer for anticipatory bail of these petitioners may be considered favourably.

Ld. P.P. has also been heard in opposition to the prayer for bail.

I have considered the submissions and have perused the order dated 19.05.2023, taking cognizance and further the endorsement under the margin regarding issuance of summons on 24.01.2026. The aforesaid delay in issuing the summon is not understandable and seemingly, it appears to be a lapse on the part of the Court concerned.

Taking note of the aforesaid submissions, particularly the submission that the petitioners having no criminal antecedents were extended protection in terms of section 41(A) of the

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI

A.B.P. No. 925/2026

Arun Yadav & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar

Chandauti P.S. Case No. 235/2022

Cr.P.C., the prayer for anticipatory bail of these petitioners is hereby **allowed**. It is directed that the petitioners in the event of arrest or surrender before the court concerned within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order, the petitioners are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of **Rs.30,000/-** with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the court concerned with condition as laid down u/s 482 of the BNSS.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-

(M.K. Kaushik)

Sessions Judge, Gayaji

11.03.2026

Date of Judgment/Order	11.03.2026
Date of reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	16.03.2026
Uploaded by	Steno (Vikash Kumar)