

In the Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge - I, Gopalganj**A.B.P. No. 372/2026**

1- Pramod Bhagat

2- Dangal yadav :----- Petitioners

V r s

The State of Bihar :-----Opposite party

Counsel for the petitioners :-----Sri Ramshraya Singh, Advocate

Counsel for the O.P. :-----Sri Deobansh Giri, Ld. P.P.

<u>11-03-2026</u>	Order	Remarks
	<p>Anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioners namely Pramod Bhagat & Dangal yadav who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Kateya, P.S. Case No. 638/2025, registered U/s. 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 303(2) & 109/3(5) BNS.</p> <p>The prosecution story, in brief, is that Rajendra Bhagat along with other accused person ambush lashed with deadly weapons like rods, swords, sticks and batons and attacked the informant and his family members due to which they got injured and later admitted to Referral Hospital, Kateya. Hence, the FIR.</p> <p>Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners argued that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel further argued that the prosecution story is totally false, fabricated and concocted. With these arguments learned counsel for the petitioners prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.</p> <p>Ld. P.P. for the State opposed the bail prayer of the petitioners.</p> <p>Heard both the parties and perused the case diary. As per FIR, specific allegation against the petitioners are that they assaulted to the informant with pharsa. There is also allegation against them that they have assaulted to the informant's nephew on the head due to which his head got ruptured and he fell down on the ground. Head is vital part of the human body. Informant in his restatement and all the injured have supported the case of the prosecution as per paragraph no. 03, 07 & 08 of the case diary. Investigation is still pending. On perusing the injury of the injured Abhishek Kumar shows lacerated wound on center of the head of size 3.5" x 1/2 x bone deep and the injury is grievous in nature. There is repeated blow by these petitioners to the informant party. As per bail petition the petitioner has criminal antecedent of one case but on perusal of the case</p>	

Contd.
11.03.2026

diary at paragraph no. 14 of the case diary shows petitioner namely Dungal Yadav has criminal antecedent of two case. It means the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent. So, at this stage petitioners do not deserved for bail.

Therefore, at this score it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, anticipatory bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

(Dictated)

(Kailash Joshi)
A.S.J.-I