

In the court of District & Addl. Sessions Judge II, Bagaha, West Champaran.

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.-187/2026

Registration No.-187/2026

(Arising out of Dhanaha P.S. Case No. 173/2025)

Vishal yadav alias Sundram Yadav S/o Digvijay Prasad Yadav.

R/o:- Tamkuhawa, P.S. Dhanaha, Dist. West Champaran..... Petitioner

vs

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

02.05.2026 Petitioner Vishal yadav @ Sundaram yadav apprehends his arrest in connection with Dhanaha P.S. Case No. 173/2025, u/s- 126(2), 352, 351(2) BNS and 27 Arms Act. pending in the learned Court of Sri Abhishek Kumar Singh J.M.F.C. Bagaha and has filed the present anticipatory bail petition which has been pressed today. Copy of the same has been served to the learned P.P. In-charge for the State.

Sri Kumar Prashant Bharti, learned counsel for the petitioner and Kamlesh sharma, learned P.P. In-charge for State are present before the Court.

The prosecution case in brief is that on 30.05.2025, the informant's daughter was on her way to her home when the petitioner intercepted her on the way and attempted to compel her to speak with him against her will. Thereafter, at approximately 4:00 PM on the same day, the informant's daughter, along with her two friends, Priyanka Kumari and Garima Kumari, had gone to attend coaching classes. The petitioner reached there as well and again attempted to force her to talk to him and upon her refusal, threatened to record her video and make it viral. Subsequently, the petitioner verbally abused the informant and his son, issued threats, and fired shots in the air. Thereafter, the petitioner fled from the spot, leaving his motorcycle behind.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to village rivalry and personal animosity. An anticipatory bail petition bearing ABP No. 594/2025 was filed before this Court on 13.08.2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn. Thereafter, no other anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner before this Court or before any other superior court. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents. All the alleged offences are bailable in nature, except Section 27 of the Arms Act; however, the said provision is not applicable to the present case as against the petitioner. The allegations made in the FIR are highly exaggerated and concocted and have been levelled only with the intention to harass and pressurize the petitioner. The alleged offences are general and

2.

Continue...

02.05.2026


omnibus in nature, and no specific overt act causing any injury has been attributed to the petitioner. It is further submitted that, as is evident from paragraphs 15 and 16 of the case diary, the statements of the witnesses do not disclose any allegation whatsoever pertaining to the Arms Act. Hence, he may kindly be granted anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P In-charge vehemently opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Upon perusal of the Lower Court Records, it appears that the petitioner is alleged to have stalked the informant's daughter, attempted to wrongfully and forcibly compel her to speak with him, and issued threats to kill her. In addition, allegations under the Arms Act have also been levelled against the petitioner. It further transpires that the petitioner has two criminal antecedents, namely Dhanaha P.S. case No. 72/2019 and Dhanaha P.S. Case No. 187/2023, which have been duly recorded in paragraph 34 of the case diary.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, material available on record as discussed above, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated & Corrected)



(Ravi Ranjan)

District & Addl. Sessions Judge II