

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65227 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-126 Year-2025 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Supaul

=====

Veena Devi Wife of Manoj Mehta @ Manoj Kumar Mehta R/o Village -
Jahalipatti, P.S.- Raghapur, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mrs. Patla Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Mushtaque Alam

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 17-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Raghapur P.S. Case No.126 of 2025 dated 05.04.2025, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 329(3), 115(2), 118(1), 109, 303(2), 352 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. As per the FIR, owing to a land dispute, the accused persons, including the petitioner, allegedly came to the house of the informant armed with deadly weapons, assaulted her causing her to become unconscious, attempted to outrage her modesty, and took away her gold and silver ornaments.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to ulterior motives. He further submits, with



reference to the contents of the FIR, that it is alleged therein that even while in an unconscious state, the informant was able to identify the accused persons, which makes the allegation doubtful. It is next submitted that the parties are agnates and there exists a long-standing land dispute between them, on account of which an FIR was lodged in the year 2022 by the husband of the petitioner, being Raghapur P.S. Case No. 56 of 2022. It is contended that by lodging the present FIR, the petitioner has been falsely roped in on the allegation of having assaulted the informant with a *dabiya* and *farsa*, allegedly causing an injury on her head, resulting in a cut injury. Learned counsel for the petitioner further draws the attention of this Court to Annexure-P/3 to submit that the nature of the injury is simple. Lastly, it is submitted that the petitioner has only one criminal antecedent.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering that the injuries are simple in nature, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the



like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned ACJM-1 Birpur/Successor Court in connection with Raghopur P.S. Case No.126 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:

(i) One of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

shikha/-

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

