

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15684 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-129 Year-2025 Thana- INDUSTRIAL District- Bhagalpur

1. Priyanka Kumari W/o Sanjeev Kumar R/o Ashish Palace, ward no 10, Zero Maile Chowk, Basant vihar, Thana - Industrial, District -Bhagalpur
2. Sujay Kumar S/o Sukindra Ray R/o Ashish Palace, ward no 10, Zero Maile Chowk, Basant vihar, Thana - Industrial, District -Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjan Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109, 352, 351(2) and 351(3) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 1 is a woman and the informant alleges that owner of Parashar Guest House is Mithilesh and he works as a guard and Ashish Palace is owned by Sanjeev and is run by his wife Priyanka and is behind Parashar Guest House, further owner of Ashish Guest House are always trying to break their customer with help of



Sujay and others and they also keep threatening him, further on 29.08.2025 at 08:30 PM, the accused persons including the petitioners along with four unknown accused in an intoxicated condition came and started abusing, on objection Ashish assaulted him by an iron object causing two injuries on his head on orders of petitioner no. 2 and petitioner no. 2 also assaulted by leg, further Mithilesh came and tried to reason out with Priyanka, but she threatened him of implicating in a rape case, thereafter he was taken to hospital where he was treated and discharged on 03.09.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that the date of occurrence is 29.08.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on 03.09.2025 i.e. after a delay of four days without any plausible explanation. It is also submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that there is a rivalry in between the owner of the guest houses for customers. It is also submitted that petitioner no. 1 has been implicated with an allegation that on her orders, Ashish assaulted and petitioner no. 2 assaulted by leg, but then the injury suffered by the injured is simple in nature. It is also submitted that it absolutely does not stand to



reason that as to why the FIR has been instituted after a delay of four days after the informant was discharged from the hospital which amply demonstrates that by way of afterthought the instant FIR came to be instituted.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail 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 trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Industrial P.S. Case No. 129 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

