

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47242 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-77 Year-2026 Thana- PARAIYA District- Gaya

1. Gauri Devi, Wife of Ramashish Yadav, Resident of Village- Khiri, P.S.- Paraiya, District- Gaya
2. Reeta Devi, Wife of Chandar Yadav, Resident of Village- Khiri, P.S.- Paraiya, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Durgesh Nandan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Dharendra Kumar Sinha, Advocate
		Mr. Yashpal Yadav, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 17-08-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant.

2. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioners under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S. for anticipatory bail apprehending their arrest, in connection with Paraiya P.S. Case No. 77 of 2026 dated 15.03.2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 103 and 3(5) of B.N.S. Similar application filed by the petitioners has been rejected by learned Court of Sessions vide order dated 15.06.2026, passed in A.B.P. No. 2176 of 2026.

3. As per allegation, 17 accused persons, including the petitioners, assaulted the victim (Ranjit Yadav), son of the



informant, and crushed him by Scorpio vehicle to death. As per further allegation, the petitioner/Gauri Devi was carrying *Khanti* in her hand, whereas the co-petitioner/Reeta Devi was carrying *Pasuli* (a type of spear) in her hand. It is also alleged that the murder has been committed on account of land dispute.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that admittedly there was land dispute between the family members of informant and that of the petitioners. He further submits that it is not possible that 17 persons will assault one person at a time. He further submits that as per the postmortem report, there is no injury of *Khanti* and *Pasuli* on the person of the victim. He also submits that as per the statement recorded of Ajit Kumar, son of the informant and brother of the deceased, no specific overt act has been alleged by him in his statement before the police against the petitioners.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioners have not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the petition that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents.

7. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for



the informant vehemently oppose the prayer of the petitioners for bail submitting that both the petitioners were having offensive weapons in their hands and they were part of unlawful assembly. They also refer to the inquest report as per which the death has been caused on account of injury caused by *gadasa*, *khanti*, rod as well as crushing by Scropio vehicle. They also submit that as per the postmortem report, there are 33 injuries on various parts of the body of the deceased and some injuries have been caused by hard and blunt substance, weapons and force.

8. Considering the serious nature of the alleged offence as well as the petitioners carrying offensive articles in their hands and the inquest report showing their role played, I am not persuaded to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby rejected.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

