

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43494 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-305 Year-2025 Thana- RIGA District- Sitamarhi

-
1. Sagira Khatoon @ Samira Khatoon Wife of Alamgir Ansari R/o Village-Bhorha P.S.- Riga, District -Sitamarhi
 2. Saista Praveen @ sahista Praveen Wife of Mazharul Haque @ Mazharul Haque Ansari R/o Village- Bhorhan P.S.- Riga, District -Sitamarhi
 3. Alamgir Ansari @ Md. Alamgir Ansari Son of Tasleem Ansari R/o Village-Bhorhan P.S.- Riga, District -Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Asif Kalim, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RANJAN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 14-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners seek the grant of anticipatory bail in connection with Riga P.S. Case No. 305 of 2025, registered under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 303(2), 109, 352, and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.).

3. The prosecution case, as alleged in the F.I.R., is that while the informant was returning home, he was surrounded by the accused party, including one Hasan, who were armed with iron rods, knives, and other weapons. Upon the informant protesting against their abuses, Alamgir Ansari assaulted the informant with a knife. Thereafter, Sagira Khatoon assaulted him indiscriminately



with an iron rod. When the brother of the informant came forward to rescue him, he was assaulted by Tamma Khatoon. There is a further allegation regarding the snatching of ₹30,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 3 and the informant are biological brothers. It is submitted that a long-standing land dispute exists between the parties, and the present case is an exaggerated version of a minor dispute. Learned counsel draws the attention of this Court toward the finding of the learned court below in its order dated 12.12.2025, whereby the first application for anticipatory bail was rejected. It is submitted that the court below noted that the nature of the injuries sustained was simple, after referring to Paragraph-27 of the case diary.

5. It is further submitted that after the passing of the order dated 12.12.2025, good sense prevailed between the brothers, and they settled their differences. Accordingly, the parties entered into a formal compromise to resolve the matter. Thereafter, a subsequent application for anticipatory bail was moved by the petitioners under changed circumstances, which was rejected vide order dated 16.05.2026, which is impugned herein.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

7. Having considered the rival submissions of the par-



ties, the familial relationship, the fact that a cross-dispute over land exists, and that the injury report confirms the nature of the injuries to be simple as noticed in the order dated 12.12.2025 following a reference to Paragraph-27 of the case diary, this Court is inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, particularly in light of the subsequent compromise arrived at between the parties.

8. Accordingly, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned court below within a period of four weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail upon furnishing bail bonds of ₹20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi, District- Sitamarhi, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (B.N.S.S.).

(Ranjan Kumar Jha, J)

rashmi/-

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

