

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65235 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-310 Year-2021 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

1. Bablu Yadav Son of Late Subhak Lala Yadav
2. Manorama Devi Wife of Bablu Yadav
3. Masomat Sudama Devi Wife of Late Vaso Yadav @ Baso Yadav
All three are resident of village - Kupari, Ward No.- 01, P.S.- Raniganj,
Dist.- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Matloob Rab, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 17-09-2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioners in this application pray for bail apprehending their arrest in connection with Raniganj P.S. Case no.310 of 2021 registered for the offence punishable under sections 341, 323, 354B, 379, 504, 308 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the five named accused persons including three petitioners herein came. Over a dispute related to construction of the house by the informant, it is stated that the petitioner no.1 started to abuse and assault the informant. He was followed by the other accused persons including petitioner nos.2 and 3 who are said to



have assaulted the daughter of the informant as a result of which she has pain and swelling in her body.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the case over a trivial dispute, which even taken at its face value is purely civil in nature relating to construction of house. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that there is no injury report of the informant brought on record. The accused persons had been giving the benefit of section 41(1) of the Cr.P.C., however, cognizance having been taken, they have moved the Court for bail. The petitioner nos.2 and 3 are ladies and none of the petitioners have any criminal antecedent.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation on petitioner no.1 of having assaulted the informant with a lathi together with the case being of the year 2021, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner no.1 on bail and the application is rejected.

7. The petitioner no.1 will surrender in the learned Court below within a period of four weeks.

8. If the petitioner no.1 so surrenders and prays for



regular bail, the same shall be considered on its own merits without being prejudiced by this order of rejection and taking into consideration grant of bail to other similarly situated co-accused as also the parties having arrived at a compromise.

9. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegation against petitioner nos.2 and 3 in the FIR together with both of them being ladies having no criminal antecedent, it is directed that the petitioner nos.2 and 3, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Raniganj P.S. Case no.310 of 2021 on each of them furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Araria.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

