

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71304 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2025 Thana- RAMPUR District- Gaya

1. Feku das @ Feku Ravidas Son of Prasad Ravidas Resident Of Village -Samir Takiya Ps -Rampur Dist -Gaya Jee
2. Manmati Devi @ Manomati Devi Wife of Feku Das @ Feku Ravidas Resident Of Village -Samir Takiya Ps -Rampur Dist -Gaya Jee
3. Saraswati Kumari Daughter of Feku Das @ Feku Rai Das Resident Of Village -Samir Takiya Ps -Rampur Dist -Gaya Jee
4. Priyanka Kumari Daughter of Feku Ravi Das @ Feku Das Resident Of Village -Samir Takiya Ps -Rampur Dist -Gaya Jee

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aryan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Bharat Lal, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 08-10-2025 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Rampur P.S. Case No. 47 of 2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 74, 109(1), 352, 351(2), 351 and 351(3) of the BNS.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he would not be pressing the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner No.1 and therefore, the



anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner No.1, namely, Feku Das @ Feku Ravidas, stands dismissed as withdrawn.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners, with respect to petitioner nos. 2, 3, and 4, submits that a perusal of the contents of the FIR would show that the allegations against these petitioners are general and omnibus in nature and no specific overt act has been attributed to any of them. It is further submitted that the petitioners are ladies. Petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 have no criminal antecedents, whereas Petitioner No. 4 is involved in only one criminal case. It is also submitted that the alleged dispute, in connection with which the occurrence is said to have taken place, does not appear to involve them directly. Learned counsel fairly submits that since there is a specific allegation against petitioner no. 1, he does not intend to press the prayer for bail on behalf of petitioner no. 1, accordingly, the same has been disposed off.

5. On the other hand, learned APP vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions of the parties and the fact that the allegations against petitioner nos. 2, 3 and 4 are general and omnibus in nature and not specific, this Court is



inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to them.

7. Let the petitioner nos. 2, 3 and 4, above named, be released on bail, in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks, from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gaya in connection with Rampur P.S. Case No. 47 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023 as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioners who shall provide official document to show their bona fide;

(ii) the petitioners 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 their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioners 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 petitioners 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)

Prakash/-

U			
---	--	--	--

