

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Supaul
B.A.-373/2026
(Arising out of Marauna P.S. Case No.60/2026)

	Chhedi Lal Yadav, S/o- Parmeshwar Yadav, R/o- Bhagwet, Ward No.05, PS- Marauna, District- Supaul; Accused/Petitioner Vs. State of Bihar O.P.	
<u>20/06/26</u>	Ld. Counsel for petitioner Mrs. Nutan Kumari, Advocate. Ld. APP Sri. Amar Kumar Das, for the State. By this order we are going to dispose off the bail application filed on behalf of the accused/ petitioner, namely Chhedi Lal Yadav, who is in judicial custody since 22.04.2026, in connection with Marauna PS Case No.:–60/26, u/s- 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 109(1), 76 of BNS. 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 local politics and enmity. He further submitted that accused/ petitioner has not involving 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 in judicial custody since 22.04.2026 and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the accused/ petitioner behind the bar. Ld. APP for the State strongly opposed the prayer of bail application. In brief, the prosecution story is that on dated 21.04.2026, at about 11:00 P.M, the accused Chhedi Lal Yadav forcibly caught hold the daughter of the informant and tried to kidnap her. When the informant objected then the accused assaulted her by the knife, thereby the informant has sustained injury. The informant further alleged that the accused also assaulted her daughter. Argument heard from both sides and perused the lower court record as well as case diary. Admittedly, this accused/ petitioner is in judicial custody since 22.04.2026. On going through the case diary, it transpires that the police also recorded the statement of the witnesses namely Shiv Nandan Yadav and the daughter of the informant and both the witnesses have duly supported the prosecution case. On going through the injury report of injured/informant Shanti Devi, the doctor has opined the nature of injury of as simple. Similarly, the injury report of the daughter of the informant is also simple. On minute scrutiny of the entire case diary, it transpires that both the informant and accused/ petitioner are of the same family and the accused/ petitioner Chhedi Lal Yadav is the younger brother of the husband of the informant. The investigation of this case is	Contd.

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Supaul
B.A.-373/2026
(Arising out of Marauna P.S. Case No.60/2026)

Contd...
20/06/26

complete and charge-sheet against the accused/ petitioner has already been submitted.

Keeping in mind the period of custody, nature of injury and other surrounding circumstances, I find that accused/ petitioner is entitled to be enlarged on bail. Therefore, the bail application, filed on behalf of accused/ petitioner, namely Chhedi Lal Yadav stands **Allowed** on furnishing bail bond of Rs.20,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court below and one of the bailor must be family member or close relative.

Dictated
-Sd-
(Anant Singh)
Sessions Judge, Supaul