

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12027 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-380 Year-2024 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

- 
1. Anil Kumar Sah @ Anil Sah Son of Kameshwar Sah Resident of Village -Bhagwanpur PS- Panapur District -Saran
  2. Kameshwar Sah Son of Chhabila Sah Resident of Village -Bhagwanpur PS- Panapur District -Saran

... .. Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Bhushan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA**

ORAL ORDER

3      01-05-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest for the offences punishable under Section 126 (2), 115, 118 (1), 109, 74, 352, 351 (2), 3 (5) of the B.N.S.

3. From perusal of the first information report, it would appear that there is general and omnibus allegations against all the accused persons being three in number that they have assaulted the informant, Champa Devi and her daughter, Kajal Kumari by means of farsa. In the last portion of the F.I.R. the allegations are specific on Anil Kumar Sah and Sunil Kumar Sah.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that so



far as petitioner no.1 is concerned, it would appear from perusal of the first information report that initially general and omnibus allegations have been made against all the accused persons and, subsequently, it has been stated that petitioner no.1 and another co-accused, Sunil Kumar Sah have indulged in the assault. There is no specific allegation against petitioner no.2. There is an allegation against petitioner no.1 that he was armed with farsa but it appears from the injury report that both the persons have suffered the injury in the nature of laceration caused by hard and blunt substance and both the injuries are simple in nature. In this view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation does not seem to be true at all. It further appears from the case diary in the supervision note recorded in paragraph-30 that after investigation the case does not appear to be true under Sections 109 and 118 of the B.N.S.

5. Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail on the ground that petitioner no.1 has one criminal antecedent. In response to this, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 is on police bail in the said case.

6. Taking into consideration the entire facts and circumstances, I am inclined to extend the privilege of



anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Panapur P. S. Case No.380 of 2024, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Trivedi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

