

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49776 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2026 Thana- JOGBANI District- Araria

Lalita Devi W/o Satyanarayan Sahni Resident of village - Indira Nagar,
Tikulia Basti, Ward No. 03, P.S - Jogbani, District - Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ramesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nagendra Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 317(5),
3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case, but then was acquitted and
is a woman and the informant alleges that on 12.03.2026 house
of the petitioner was raided and 13 bicycles were recovered and
petitioner fled, further Rubi disclosed that petitioner and Veena
indulge in selling and buying of stolen bicycles.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioners submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in
the instant case by the informant, it is further submitted that



house of petitioner is bordering Nepal, as such, Nepali citizen come for marketing to the village and they park their cycles in the courtyard of the petitioner and when the police raided, cycles of Nepali citizen were found parked in the courtyard of the petitioner and thus petitioner came to be implicated, it is further submitted that petitioner was not apprehended from the spot and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that Rubi disclosed that petitioner and Veena indulge in selling and buying of stolen bicycle, but then also disclosed that petitioner was not in the village and had gone to Khagaria, as such, it might be a possibility that daughter-in-law falsely implicated the mother-in-law, it is also submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove her innocence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions and taking into consideration the fact that learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/-



(Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Jogbani P.S. Case No. 58 of 2026 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. However, it is made clear that, in the event, if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event, the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

