

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 678/2026

Rajeev Kumar Yadav Vs. The State of Bihar
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 09/2026

16.06.2026

1. The present anticipatory bail application has been preferred by petitioner **Rajeev Kumar Yadav**, s/o- Premanand Yadav, who is apprehending arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 09/2026 u/ss 126(2), 115(2), 318(4), 316(2), 303(2) and 3(5) of B.N.S., pending in the Court of Ld. C.J.M., Munger.

2. The informant has alleged that the petitioner and the co-accused Shubham Kumar took an amount of Rs. 7,43,000/- from him on the pretext of getting job. That when the informant asked to return the money both the accused persons assaulted him and they snatched Rs. 5,000/- and a gold locket from him. Hence the information, based on which the above stated P.S. case was registered.

3. At the outset the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has certified that previously no anticipatory or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner before this Court or before any other Court including the Hon'ble High Court. He also certified that **the petitioner has no criminal case pending against him**. The Ld. Counsel submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence and further that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. That no case u/s 318(4) and 316(2) of B.N.S.S. is not made out against the petitioner. Therefore the Ld Counsel pleads that the petitioner be granted the privilege of pre-arrest bail.

4. The Ld. P.P. has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a named accused of the F.I.R. That the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 28, 39, 40, 65 and 66 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. That the investigation in

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 678/2026

Rajeev Kumar Yadav Vs. The State of Bihar
Muffasil P.S. Case No. 09/2026

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 seems that the petitioner is a named accused of the F.I.R. and the allegations pertain to taking money on the pretext of getting a job and from paras 3 to 20 of the case diary it is apparent that in total about Rs. 7,43,000/- has been deposited in the account of the present petitioner. That the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 28, 39, 40, 65 and 66 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. That the investigation in the case is continuing.

7. Therefore, considering 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:- 16.06.2026