

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI

A.B.P. No. 949/2026

**Dharamdev Kumar Yadav @ Sakaldeo Yadav Vs. The State
of Bihar**

Mufassil P.S. Case No. 863/2025

12.03.2026

Present :

For the petitioner-----: Sri Radhekant Sharma, Ld. Advocate

For the State-----: Sri S.B. Ojha, Ld. P.P.

The present petition for anticipatory bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner Dharamdev Kumar Yadav @ Sakaldeo Yadav apprehending his arrest in connection with Mufassil P.S. Case No. 863/2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 303(2), 317(2), 111(3), 111(4) of the BNS.

Ld. counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to local politics. He further submits that the petitioner is the owner of the alleged tractor and he had no role in the alleged transportation of sand.

Ld. P.P. vehemently opposed the prayer for bail submitting that the petitioner is a member of a group involved in organized crime. He further submits that the petitioner is the owner of the tractor which was found transporting sand and the offence forms part of organized criminal activity. He further contended that the petitioner has a prior criminal history of involvement in similar nature namely Mufassil P.S. Case No. 238/2021, which he himself has referred to in Para-3 of the bail petition and this antecedent demonstrates the petitioner's propensity to commit such offences, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail should not be considered favourably.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYAJI

A.B.P. No. 949/2026

**Dharamdev Kumar Yadav @ Sakaldeo Yadav Vs. The State
of Bihar**

Mufassil P.S. Case No. 863/2025

Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner and the ld. P.P. and upon perusal of the record, it appears that the petitioner is the owner of the tractor which was allegedly used for transporting stolen sand. The allegations pertain to organized crime and the petitioner has a prior criminal history of similar nature which has been referred to in Para-3 of the bail petition itself.

In light of the gravity of the offence and the antecedents of the petitioner, this Court does not find it proper to extend the special privilege of anticipatory bail to this petitioner.

Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application stands **dismissed**.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-

(M.K. Kaushik)
Sessions Judge, Gayaji
12.03.2026

Date of Judgment/Order	12.03.2026
Date of reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	25.03.2026
Uploaded by	Steno (Vikash Kumar)