

(Arising out of Triveniganj PS Case No:-313/2025)

	Chandan Yadav, S/o- Late Bhumi Yadav, R/o- Karminiya, Ward No.06, PS-Triveniganj, District- Supaul; Accused/Petitioner Vs. State of Bihar.O.P.	
25/03/2026	Ld. Counsel for petitioner Sri. Om Prakash Ambedkar, Advocate. Ld. PP Sri. J.N.Pandey, for the State. By this order we are going to dispose off the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of accused/ petitioner, namely Chandan Yadav, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Triveniganj PS case No.313/25, u/s- 126(2), 115(2), 352, 351(2), 109(1), 303(2), 3(5) of B.N.S. Ld. counsel for the accused/ petitioner argued that accused/ petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no crime and he has falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics and land dispute. He further submitted that accused/ petitioner is not involved in any other case and having the clean antecedent. He further submitted that the offence as alleged in FIR is not applicable against the accused/ petitioner. It is also submitted that accused/ petitioner is ready to abide by the provisions of section 482 of B.N.S.S, so he may be admitted to the anticipatory bail. Ld. PP for the State strongly opposed the anticipatory bail application. In brief, the prosecution story is that on dated 20.06.2025 at about 06:00 A.M., the accused Chandan Yadav, Bimla Devi, Raushan Yadav and Vikash Kumar having the deadly weapon forcibly stopped the informant and called him at their door and started abusing him. Accused Chandan Yadav forcibly put the informant on the ground and slapped him. Accused Bimla Devi has instigated the other accused persons then accused Chandan Yadav and Raushan Yadav having the iron-rod and other weapon assaulted the informant on his head, thereby he sustained injury and blood was started oozing and also repeatedly assaulted on his arms and legs. Thereafter, the informant become unconscious and the accused persons also snatched Rs.5000/- from his pocket. When the villagers were gathered there then the accused persons ran away from there. Argument heard from both sides and perused the record as well as case diary. On going through the case diary, it transpires that the police has also recorded the statement of the witnesses namely Laldev Yadav and Chandrika Devi and they have duly supported the prosecution case. Though as per para No.44 of the case diary, this accused/ petitioner is having the clean antecedent. As per the injury report of the	Contd.

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Supaul
A.B.A.-229/2026
(Arising out of Triveniganj PS Case No:-313/2025)

<u>Contd.</u> <u>25/03/2026</u>	injured/ informant as stated by the I.O in para No.17 of the case diary, the doctor has altogether 4 injuries i.e., (i) lacerated wound on the scalp size 1cm x 1/2cm x ½ cm, (ii) Bruise on the left hand 2cm x 1 cm, (iii) Swelling on the right thigh 2 cm x 2 cm and (iv) swelling on the left leg 2 cm x 2 cm. However, the doctor has opined the nature of injury as simple. On minute scrutiny of the entire case as well as especially the statement of the informant and the injury report, a 73 years old informant/ injured was assaulted by the accused persons. The verbal evidence given by the informant is duly corroborated by the injury found by the doctor. Though the doctor has opined the nature of injury as simple, but keeping in mind the age of the injured/ informant and he sustained 4 injuries. The accused/ petitioner does not deserve any leniency. The investigation of this is in primary stage. The custodial interrogation of accused/ petitioner is also required. The tempering of the prosecution evidence also cannot be ruled out. Hence, keeping in mind the seriousness of allegation, I find that accused/ petitioner is not entitled to get the benefit of anticipatory bail. As such, the prayer of the anticipatory bail, on behalf of all accused/ petitioner Chandan Yadav is hereby, Rejected. Dictated -Sd- (Anant Singh) Sessions Judge, Supaul	
--	---	--