

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1121 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-410 Year-2025 Thana- SAMASTIPUR MUFFASIL District-
Samastipur

-
1. Rampari Devi Wife of Subodh Mahto Resident of village- Chhatauna Ps-
Muffasil Dist- Samastipur
 2. Subodh Mahto Son of Late Rambilash Mahto Resident of village-
Chhatauna Ps- Muffasil Dist- Samastipur
 3. Niraj Mahto Son of Subodh Mahto Resident of village- Chhatauna Ps-
Muffasil Dist- Samastipur
 4. Ravishankar Kumar @ Hajari Mahto son of Deepak Mahto Resident of
village- Chhatauna Ps- Muffasil Dist- Samastipur
 5. Kalpna Devi @ Kalpana Devi Wife of Niraj Mahto Resident of village-
Chhatauna Ps- Muffasil Dist- Samastipur
 6. Vibha Devi @ Bibha Devi Wife of Deepak Mahto Resident of village-
Chhatauna Ps- Muffasil Dist- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Brajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Md. Ataur Rahman, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Praduman Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 04-02-2026 Heard Mr. Brajesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for

the petitioners and Mr. Praduman Kumar, learned counsel

representing the informant beside the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in
connection with Mufassil P.S. Case No. 410 of 2025 instituted
under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 76, 118(1), 109(1), 117(2),
303(2), 329(4), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nayay
Sanhita, 2023 lodged on 06.10.2025 by the informant, Priyanka



Kumari.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that Deepak Mahto entered her house and outraged her modesty. Further, he gave injury on her cheek and when the lady opposed, missed out his 'Dhoti' in the house of the informant itself. The accused persons wanted the 'Dhoti' back and upon refusal and as they wanted to lodge FIR, allegation is that all the accused persons armed variously came and assaulted the family members of the informant. Allegation is against almost all the accused persons who were armed variously and injured the informant's side. This led to the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that though there are allegation against the accused persons, some of the injuries have been found to be grievous, others have been found to be simple in nature. Further, the ladies have also been implicated in the case.

5. The informant is appearing in the present case and he has taken this Court to paragraph-3 to show that it has been recorded that the petitioners have never been convicted in any criminal case previously. The submission is that the present petitioners are accused in Samastipur (mufassil) P.S. Case No. 115 of 2015 which has not been brought on record.



6. Considering the submissions of the parties as also the statement of the learned counsel for the informant which has not been rebutted by the learned counsel for the petitioners, material facts have been suppressed, in that background, no relief can be granted.

7. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

