IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78031 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011093282026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-269 Year-2026 Thana- GHANSHYAMPUR District- Darbhanga

==========

1. Neetu Devi Wife of Mayaram Yadav Resident of Village- Kumai, Ward 08, Police Station- Ghanshyampur, District -Darbhanga
2. Rinku Devi @ Rinku Kumari Son of Dayaram Yadav @ Dayanand Yadav Resident of Village- Kumai, Ward 08, Police Station- Ghanshyampur, District -Darbhanga
3. Dayanand Yadav @ Dayaram yadav son of Dukhi Yadav Resident of Village- Kumai, Ward 08, Police Station- Ghanshyampur, District -Darbhanga

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nilendu Kumar Choudhary, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajiv Nayan, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 05-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Ghansyampur P.S. Case No. 269 of 2026 for the offence punishable under sections 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 324(4), 109(1), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS lodged on 05.08.2026 by the informant, Raja Ram Yadav.

3. As per the prosecution case, the allegation against the petitioners is that they allegedly assaulted the informant by means fists and slaps and even parents of the informant were assaulted brutally and the informant was brought to the Biraul

WEB COPY

Government Hospital from where, he was referred to DMCH. Accordingly, the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the parties are agnates and there is ongoing land dispute between the parties. Learned counsel for the petitioners by referring to the allegation levelled in the FIR, submits that the informant himself has made statement before the police that it is the Maya Ram Yadav who is said to have caused injuries over the head of the informant while the injuries have been found to be simple in nature. Petitioners have got clean antecedent and they are ready to co-operate.

5. Learned APP opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the nature of injury to be simple in nature and the petitioners have got clean antecedent, this Court is inclined to extend them the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Let the petitioners, above named, be released on bail in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ***Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Biraul, Darbhanga*** in connection with

WEB COPY

aforesaid PS Case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document 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 his/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;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his/their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

U		T	

WEB COPY