

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38510 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-145 Year-2025 Thana- Sonki District- Darbhanga

Sunita Devi W/o Gauri Shankar Mahto R/o Dekuli Chatti, Basdeopur
Darbhanga Kapchhahi, P.S.- Sonki, District- Darbhanga, Bihar- 846009

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Raj Kumar Rajesh, Advocate
		Mr. Jeet Kishor Mahto, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Amitesh Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2),
115(2), 118(1), 109, 132, 191(2), 191(3), 190, 324(4)(5), 74 and
127(2) of the B.N.S.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of one case
under the Excise Act and the informant based on an information
alleges that house of petitioner was raided and from her
possession 1.2 liters of liquor was recovered and when Sunita
was being brought to Police Station by police when crowd
gathered forming an unlawful assembly and tried to flee Sunita



after attacking the force.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that it does not with clarity allege whether petitioner was taken to the police station after being arrested or not. It is further submitted petitioner was not arrested from the place of occurrence, as such, the instant anticipatory bail application has been filed.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that petitioner was apprehended by Sonali and on search 1.2 liters of liquor was recovered from her and it appears that accused persons gathered at the place of occurrence and thereafter assaulted the police force including the informant brutally and even damaged two police vehicles for freeing the petitioner, it is thus submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the same will send a wrong message.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the



privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

