IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65013 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010935102026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-71 Year-2026 Thana- LAUKAHA District- Madhubani

==========

1. Ramrati Devi S/o Shivuram @ Shivchandra Ram @ Shiv Kumar Ram R/o - Shivnagar, P.S - Laukaha, District - Madhubani
2. Poonam Devi W/o Umesh Kumar Ram @ Umesh Ram R/o - Shivnagar, P.S - Laukaha, District - Madhubani

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Pramila Devi W/o Late Saini Ram R/o - Bauraha, P.S - Laukaha, District - Madhubani.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Asha Kumari, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Pramod Kumar Yadav, Adv.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 29-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State and, as also, counsel for the Informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Laukaha P.S. Case No. 71 of 2026 dated 31.03.2026 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 137, 96, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 19.02.2026, the accused Umesh Ram and Hare Ram allegedly kidnapped the informant’s 16-year-old daughter for marriage. When the informant sought her return, Ramrati Devi and Poonam Devi

WEB COPY

allegedly abused and threatened her, refusing to return the girl on the ground that the marriage had been solemnized.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is next submitted that there is contradiction in the statement recorded by the victim girl and, as also, the allegation made in the F.I.R., while there is nothing against the petitioners. It is further submitted that the specific allegation of sexual assault is against the co-accused Umesh Ram and Hare Ram. It is lastly submitted that the petitioners are lady and have no antecedent.

5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State and the Informant are present but, have not objected the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and considering the contradiction between the statement of the victim girl and the allegations made in the F.I.R. and, as also, the fact that the petitioners are women and have no criminal antecedents, let the above named petitioners, be released on bail, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two

WEB COPY

sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jhanjharpur, Madhubani in connection with Laukaha P.S. Case No. 71 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. as well as the following conditions:

(i) One of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document / personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

rishi/-

U		T	

WEB COPY