IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23397 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-358 Year-2025 Thana- CHHAURADANO District- East Champaran

==========

Suniti Kumari Mehta Son of Sahil Mehta Resident of Village - Balirama, P.S. - Chhauradano.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kundan Rathore @ Kundan Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bharat Lal, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

2 18-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the informant and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Chhauradano P.S. Case No. 358 of 2025 in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 110, 352, 351(2) and later on 109(1) of the BNS, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is alleged to have abused and assaulted the informant with *gadasi* on neck due to which she sustained cut injury.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it would be evident from the first information report itself that a verbal altercation took place between the petitioner and the

WEB COPY

informant on account of which it is stated that she inflicted a *gadasi* blow on the neck of the informant due to which she sustained bleeding injury. It is further submitted that the petitioner and the informant are neighbors having land dispute and also a dispute with regard to boundary. It is further submitted that the injury sustained by the informant is no doubt in the nature of a incised wound on the left side of the neck but it would appear from the bail rejection order that in paragraph 29 of the case diary, the final opinion with regard to the injury is said to be normal study. It has also been submitted that Section 109 of the BNS would not be attracted as there is no allegation of any repetition of blow. Further, the petitioner is a lady having clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP for the State have vehemently opposed the application for anticipatory bail by stating that the petitioner has inflicted injury on vital part of the informant causing injury.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also considering the background of a dispute which took place at the spur of the moment coupled with the fact that there is a dispute between two neighbors and the petitioner is a lady having no criminal antecedent, let the above

WEB COPY

named petitioner, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, be enlarged on bail 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 court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Chhauradano P.S. Case No. 358 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S., subject to the conditions that:

(I) One of the bailors will be a family member/close relative.

(II) The petitioner shall cooperate in the investigation/trial and in case of non-cooperation, the prosecution would be at liberty to move an application for cancelling the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

priyanka/-

U		T	

WEB COPY