

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE- XVth, GAYA JEE
A.B.P. No. 1008/2026
(Arising out of Tekari P.S. Case No. 86/2026)

1. Subhash Yadav, aged about 55 Years, S/o Late Kameshwar Yadav
 2. Alok Kumar, aged about 28 Years, S/o Subhash Yadav @ Subhash Kumar
 3. Ishwari Yadav @ Ishwar Yadav, aged about 44 Years, S/o Ganga Yadav
 4. Ravi Kumar @ Ravi Raj, aged about 22 Years, S/o Ishwari Yadav @ Ishwar Yadav
 5. Bittu Kumar @ Bittu Banty, aged about 19 Years, S/o Ishwari Yadav @ Ishwar Yadav
 6. Lavkush Kumar, aged about 18 Years, S/o Ishwari Yadav @ Ishwar Yadav
 7. Ramchandra Yadav, aged about 76 Years, S/o Late Prasad Yadav
 8. Vimlesh Kumar, aged about 33 Years, S/o Dularchand Yadav
- All R/o At Village- Bajitpur, P.S. Tekari, District- Gaya Jee
9. Pintu Kumar, aged about 30 Years, S/o Suresh Yadav
 10. Suresh Yadav @ Suresh Prasad Yadav, aged about 71 Years, S/o Charittar Yadav @ Late Ramcharitar Yadav
- Both R/o At Village- Fenagi, P.S. Tekari, District- Gaya Jee

.....Petitioners.

Vs

The State of Bihar

.....Opposite party.

Present :- Sri Rajesh Mohan, District & Additional Sessions Judge-XVth,Gaya Jee.
Learned Counsel for the petitioners:-Sri Abhishek Singh, Advocate.
Learned APP for the State:- Sri Rajendra Kumar, Ld. Advocate.

06-05-2026 The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Tekari P.S. Case No. 86/2026, registered for the offence punishable U/S 126(2), 127(2), 115(2), 303(2), 324(4), 324(5), 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) B.N.S. and 27 Arms Act, pending in the court of learned A.C.J.M.-VI, Gaya Jee.

As per the F.I.R. the prosecution story in narrow compass. The informant has filed a written complaint to the S.H.O. Tekari P.S., Gaya Jee, inter alia therein stating that the petitioners have committed mischief with the vehicle of the informant bearing Registration No. BR-26Y0761 and damaged it and also taken away the said vehicle. It is further alleged that the accused persons named in the F.I.R. have also resolved firing. However, anyhow, the informant could save his life. And to this effect the instant F.I.R. has been lodged.

As earlier called for, case diary is received to this Court.

Heard Learned counsel for the petitioners and Learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners are quite innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case due to land dispute. He further submits that the earlier to this no such an application for anticipatory bail has ever been filed on behalf the

In the court of District and Additional Sessions Judge-XVth, Gaya Jee.

A.B.P. No. 1008/2026

Arising out of Tekari P.S. Case no. 86/2026

Subhash Yadav and others

Vs

-----petitioners.

State of Bihar

-----opposite party.

petitioners either before the Learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, Gaya Jee, or Hon'ble Patna High Court. He further submits that the petitioner no. 7 and 8 namely Ramchandra Yadav and Vimlesh Kumar have no criminal antecedent however, rest petitioners are also accused Tekari P.S. Case No. 177/2025 registered u/s 126(2), 115(2), 109, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) BNS and 27 Arms Act. He further submits that both the parties are belong to the same family. He further submits that the petitioner no. 03, Ishwari Yadav, has also lodged a case vide Tekari P.S. Case No. 213/2025 u/s 126(1), 126(2), 115(2), 109, 74,303(2), 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) BNS and 27 Arms Act. He further submits that the petitioners are ready to face the trial and prays for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioners.

The Ld. APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioners. He further submits that from perusal of the case diary, it appears that the witnesses examined during the course of investigation have supported the prosecution story as stated in the FIR. He further submits that the stolen motorcycle has not been recovered as yet.

Under the facts and circumstances stated above and going through the F.I.R. and the relevant para of the case diary and also also having regard to the rival submissions of both sides and considering the allegation cast in the F.I.R. and pendency of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the prayer of anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioners is hereby **rejected**.

Accordingly, this anticipatory bail petition is **dismissed**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rajesh Mohan)

District and Additional Sessions Judge-XVth, Gaya Jee.

06-05-2026

Date of reserving of order	06-05-2026
Date of order	06-05-2026
Uploading date	13-05-2026
Uploaded by	Pankaj Kumar Sinha