

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32905 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2026 Thana- SASARAM MUFFSIL District- Rohtas

Lali Chaudhary S/O Late Devi Chaudhary R/O Village- Shivpur Chitauli, P.S-
Agrer, Distt.- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEEN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 13-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in connection with Sasaram Mufassil P.S. Case No. 101 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 76 and 351(2) of the B.N.S.

3. As per the allegation, the petitioner who happens to be the cousin father-in-law of the informant used to keep a bad eye upon her and on 11.02.2026 at 12.30 A.M, the petitioner entered the room of the informant after scaling the wall and tried to contract physical relationship with her. Upon alarm being raised people assembled there, thereafter the petitioner fled away from the place of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the present allegation has been levelled in the backdrop of previous litigation in which the petitioner's daughter had filed a complaint case against the brother of the informant's husband and other family members vide Complaint Case No. 1146 of 2022 in which after enquiry cognizance was taken against them and that case is fixed for evidence before charge and hence the present false case has been lodged in order to put pressure and to blackmail. The informant has also filed a Complaint Case No. 268 of 2026 with same and similar allegation against the petitioner and others. It has further been submitted that no occurrence as alleged ever took place and there are no ingredients of Section 76 B.N.S. It has lastly been submitted that petitioner has got one criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Heard the parties and perused the record.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the previous litigation, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on anticipatory 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 concerned, Rohtas in connection with Sasaram
Mufassil P.S. Case No. 101 of 2026, subject to conditions as laid
down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Praveen Kumar, J)

shivam/-

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

