

IN THE COURT OF SATYA BHUSHAN ARYA, SESSIONS JUDGE, BANKA

Ram Pukar Yadav & Anr. Vs. State

Bail Petition No. 165 of 2026

Date of filing : 02.03.2026

Date of order : 09.04.2026

1. Ram Pukar Yadav, aged about 45 years, son of Dashrath Yadav

2. Rinku Devi, aged about 33 years, wife of Rampukar Yadav

Both residents of village-Baghwa, P.S.-Bandhuwa Kurawa, District-Banka

..... Petitioners

-Versus-

State of Bihar

.....Opposite Party

Present :- Sri Akhilesh Kumar Singh, Advocate for the Petitioners

Sri Hira Lal Singh, Public Prosecutor for the State

ORDER

1. *Yearning for an order of emancipation the bail petition has been filed by the petitioners, who are booked in Bandhuwa Kuraba Police Station Case No. 19 of 2026, for the offence allegedly committed under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 109(1), 303, 351(2), 316, 3/5 of BNS and are confined in jail since 21.02.2026.*

2. *The case of prosecution is based upon a gravamen filed by one Babita Devi, with the allegations that on 20.02.2026, at about 09:00 AM, her husband went to give Rs. 20,000/- to someone for his treatment. At about 02:00 PM, people of Baghwa village sent photo of her husband in unconscious condition on the mobile of her villagers. Later on, she received an information that (i). Rampukar Yadav, (ii). Rinku Devi with intent to kill assaulted her husband and threw him near Dwarve Sthan by thinking him dead. When she telephoned her husband, then Rinku Devi picked phone and said that her husband has died and she can take his body. The villagers informed to police and the police took her husband to hospital. When she reached to hospital, her husband in unconscious condition said Ram Pukar Yadav and Rinku Devi assaulted him with intent to kill and snatched Rs. 20,000/-, motorcycle and mobile phone.*

3. *In oral arguments, learned counsel for petitioners submitted that they have*

IN THE COURT OF SATYA BHUSHAN ARYA, SESSIONS JUDGE, BANKA

Ram Pukar Yadav & Anr. Vs. State

Bail Petition No. 165 of 2026

Date of filing : 02.03.2026

Date of order : 09.04.2026

falsely been implicated in this case. He drew attention on the injury reports wherein the doctor opined simple injury and not on any vital part of the body. It is further argued that it is a family matter. The petitioner is having no criminal antecedent and petitioner is confined in jail since 21.02.2026.

4. *In counter, learned Public Prosecutor for the State stoutly opposed the bail application.*

5. *Heard rival submissions and perused the record. Keeping in view the nature of allegation as well as injury, this court finds no reason to keep the accused in custody anymore; therefore, the accused/ petitioners are ordered to be emancipated on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of trial court. Out of the two sureties, one will be of the same village or close relative of petitioners.*

6. *File be consigned to the record room and that of trial court be sent back with a copy of this order.*

7. *Keeping in view the General Order no. 1 of 1991 (Criminal) dated 07.03.1991, the certified copy of FIR, if desired, be returned back to the petitioners on placing the xerox copy thereof on record.*

(Dictated)

(Satya Bhushan Arya)
Sessions Judge, Banka