

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11834 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-277 Year-2025 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Supaul

-
1. Dona Devi @ Dauna Devi Wife of Late Jamadar Sada Resident of village - Koriyapatti, Ward No.- 04, Police Station - Raghapur, District - Supaul
 2. Sanita Kumari @ Sanita Devi Wife of Surjeet Sada @ Hathkatta Resident of village - Koriyapatti, Ward No.- 04, Police Station - Raghapur, District - Supaul

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Amitesh Kumar,APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 26-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Raghapur P.S. Case No. 277 of 2025 dated 15.07.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 127(2), 115(2), 109, 140(1) and 238 of the B.N.S.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has alleged that the named accused persons had called and taken away the son of the informant, who did not return. The F.I.R. was



lodged with such report that his son was missing and he had apprehension that his son might have been killed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were not named in the F.I.R. and during the course of investigation, the name of the petitioners surfaced in the confessional statement of the apprehended co-accused persons. It has further been submitted that even though the statement has taken into account, the only allegation is that they were in connivance with the said accused persons. However, no specific role has been assigned to these petitioners who are apparently ladies. It has next been submitted that there is nothing on record to suggest that the petitioners were involved in any manner barring the confessional statement, which does not have evidentiary value. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioners have clean antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions made by the parties and taking into account the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners above named, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on



furnishing bail-bonds 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 Raghopur P.S. Case No. 277 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of BNSS as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors will be a close relative of the petitioners.

(ii) The petitioners shall remain physically present before the concerned Court on each and every date of the trial and shall cooperate in the investigation.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bonds of the petitioners will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) The trial court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case, at any stage, it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the trial court shall take necessary steps for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioners. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.



7. It is made clear that the observations, if any, made in this order, shall be of no bearing during the trial.
8. The application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Gautam/-

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

