

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.86265 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2025 Thana- MANSURCHAK District- Begusarai

Basanti Devi @ Basanti Wife of Nandlal Mahto Resident of village-
Sahilwara PS - Mansurchak District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sabal Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Nirmala Kumari, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 20-01-2026 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), 303(2), 74, 75, 125, 109 and 3(5) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and
the informant alleges that she was going to attend the call of
nature on 07.09.2025 at 04:30 p.m. when Vikash intercepted her
and forcefully tried to take her to his house and on alarm her
husband and mother-in-law came to save her but the named
accused persons including the petitioner came and petitioner
assaulted her by Musal causing injury on her head while
Nandlal and Bibha assaulted the mother-in-law of the informant



causing injury on her right hand while her husband received injury on his face and Vikash took her chain.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being the mother of Vikash. It is further submitted that petitioner and the informant are neighbours and are having dispute relating to drainage but then the instant false case came to be instituted alleging that Vikash was trying to act inappropriately with the informant. It is next submitted that no doubt petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the informant by Musal causing injury on her head which has been opined to be grievous but then the blow was not repeated. It is also submitted that petitioner has been implicated also for the reason that she is government employee and is the sole earning member of the family, as such, by implicating her, the entire family would be coerced and the dispute relating to drain would automatically be solved in favour of the informant and her side. It is further submitted that the date of occurrence is 07.09.2025 and the FIR came to be instituted on 09.09.2025 i.e. after a delay of two days which also shows that by way of afterthought the petitioner came to be implicated being a government servant.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for



anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees 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 Mansurchak P.S. Case No. 97 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the BNSS.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

