

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER**  
**ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 368/2026**

Vijo Yadav and other Vs. The State of Bihar  
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 49/2026

**24.04.2026**

1. The present anticipatory bail application has been preferred by petitioners **1. Vijo Yadav**, s/o- Ganga Yadav and **2. Chandan Yadav**, s/o- Vijo Yadav who are apprehending arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 49/2026 u/ss 3126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 308(3), 352, 351(2), 191(2), 191(3) of B.N.S. and section 190 Ordinance Act, 1959, pending in the Court of Ld. C.J.M., Munger.

2. The informant has alleged that all the accused persons including the petitioners with an intention to kill fired 30-40 round gun shots in air. Hence the information, based on which the above stated P.S. case was registered.

3. At the outset the Ld. Counsel for the petitioners has certified that previously no anticipatory or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioners before this Court or before any other Court including the Hon'ble High Court. He also certified that **the petitioners have two criminal cases pending against them.** The Ld. Counsel submits that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence and further that they have been falsely implicated in the present case. That nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Therefore the Ld Counsel pleads that the petitioners be granted the privilege of pre-arrest bail.

4. The Ld. P.P. assisted with the Ld. Counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer of bail application of the petitioners and submits the regular bail application of the co-accused Rohit Yadav has already been rejected by this Court vide order dated 25.03.2026 in B.A. No. 692/2026. He further alleged that the petitioners are the named accused of the F.I.R. That

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER**  
**ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 368/2026**

Vijo Yadav and other Vs. The State of Bihar  
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 49/2026

the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 5 and 6 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. That the investigation in the case is continuing.

5. Heard the submissions of respective Id. Counsels and perused the record of the case.

6. From perusal of the case record, it appears that the petitioners are the named accused of the F.I.R. That five round cartridges have been recovered in front of the house of the informant. That the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 5 and 6 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. That the investigation in the case is continuing. That the petitioners have two criminal cases pending against them as per para 3 of the present anticipatory bail application.

7. Therefore, considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the nature of allegations and in the totality of the facts and the circumstances of the case in my view no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. Hence, the present petition is hereby **Rejected**.

**Dictated**

**(ALOK GUPTA)**  
**Sessions Judge, Munger**  
**Dated:- 24.04.2026**