

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28828 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-345 Year-2025 Thana- LAKHAURA District- East Champaran

1. Shripatti Devi, Wife of Jainath Mahto @ Jainath Prasad Kushwaha, Resident of village - Jinarwa Phulwar, P.S.- Lakhaura, Dist.- East Champaran.
2. Deepak Kumar, Son of Harendra Prasad Kushwaha @ Harendra Prasad, Resident of village- Jinarwa Phulwar, P.S.- Lakhaura, Dist.- East Champaran.
3. Pradeep Kumar, Son of Hiranman Mahto @ Hiranman Prasad Kushwaha Resident of village- Jinarwa Phulwar, P.S.- Lakhaura, Dist.- East Champaran.
4. Vivek Kumar, Son of Sanjay Prasad Kushwaha @ Sanjay Kumar, Resident of village - Jinarwa phulwar, P.S.- Lakhaura, Dist.- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Sharda Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 01-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Lakhaura P.S. Case No. 345 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 109(1), 333, 196, 351(2), 191, 352 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, as per the allegations, petitioner no. 1 along with co-accused, namely Jainath Mahto, is alleged to have assaulted the injured Raees Alam by means of a lathi and an iron rod, however, the



injury sustained is stated to be simple in nature. It is further submitted that there is no specific allegation against petitioner no. 1 with regard to assault upon the other injured persons. It is also submitted that no specific allegation has been made against petitioner nos. 2 and 3. So far as petitioner no. 4 is concerned, though there is a specific allegation of assault upon the injured Sajid Alam but he is stated to be a young person. Learned counsel further submits that cordial relations have now been restored between the parties and a compromise petition has already been filed by the informant before the learned trial court.

4. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

5. In the facts and circumstances of the case, and considering the statements made in the petition as well as the aforesaid submissions, and the nature of allegations appearing against petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3, in my opinion, they deserve to be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, **let the petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 named-above**, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty



Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Court concerned in connection with Lakhaura P.S. Case No. 345 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

6. Considering the nature of allegation appearing against the petitioner no. 4, his prayer for bail is rejected.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

maynaz/-

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

