

Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraul(Darbhangha)

Present:- Sri Shiv Kumar,

Dist.&Addl. Sess. Judge, Biraul.

BP No. 136/2026(Ranjeet Chaupal vs. State of Bihar)

Page No. 1 of 3

In the Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraul, Darbhanga

BP No. 136 of 2026

In the matter of :

1. Ranjeet Chaupal, Son of Late Garib Chaupal

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

2. The State of BiharOpposite Party.

For the petitioner:- Sri Sanjay Kumar Ram, Ld. Advocate.

For the O.P.(State):- Sri Bachha Rai, Ld. APP.

Order

23.07.2026 The present bail petition has been filed on behalf of the above-named petitioner, who is in judicial custody since 29.04.2026, in connection with Kuseshwar Asthan PS case no. 87 of 2026, for the offences U/Ss 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 76, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, which is pending in the court of Ld. SDJM, Biraul, Darbhanga.

Heard Sri Sanjay Kumar Ram the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner and Sri Bachcha Rai Ld. Counsel for State.

The FIR in the present case has been lodged on the basis of application of informant namely Ramashish Ram. The case of the prosecution in brief is that on 25.03.2026 at around 4 PM the accused persons as named in the FIR including petitioner with two other persons armed with lathi, danda, iron Khanti, sharp edged Dabiya forcibly taken informant from his house with intent to kill him. Ashok Chaupal and Sanjeet Chaupal attacked on him with intent to kill. Ranjeet Chaupal attacked informant with sharp edged dabiya on his head due to which informant's head got fractured. Sushil Chaupal assaulted Ram Bilash Ram, who came to save informant, with iron Khanti on

Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraoul(Darbhanga)

Present:- Sri Shiv Kumar,

Dist.&Addl. Sess. Judge, Biraoul.

BP No. 136/2026(Ranjeet Chaupal vs. State of Bihar)

Page No. 2 of 3

his head. Karan Chaupal and Rajkishor Chaupal and female accused persons assaulted female family members of the informant's family. Renu Devi snatched gold Chakti from Bimla Devi's neck. After that informant and his brother had been taken to PHC, Satighat.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is quite innocent and he has not committed any offence. The petitioner has falsely been implicated in this false case. NO such occurrence did ever take place as alleged in the FIR. No case under section 109(1) and 76 of BNS is made out against the petitioner. There is delay of 6 days in lodging the FIR. There is case and counter case between the parties. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 29.04.2026. The petitioner is ready to abide by all the conditions as imposed by the Court. Therefore the present petition may be allowed.

On the other hand, Ld. Addl. P.P appearing on behalf of the State opposed the prayer for bail.

Upon considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the materials available on record this court finds that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that he has assaulted informant with dabiya on his head. Para 2 of the case diary mentions restatement of informant/injured in which he has supported the prosecution's case and reiterated the same version as alleged in the FIR. Para 3 of the case diary mentions statement of injured Rambilash Ram who too have supported the case and stated that Ranjeet Chaupal assaulted informant with dabiya on his head with intent to kill. The injury report of Ramashish Ram issued from PHC, K.Ashthan, Satighat, is attached with the case diary from perusal whereof it appears that he has received pain and swelling on the head and forehead, abrasion on head, lacerated wound on head about (1"X0.5"). Further the injury report of Rambilash Ram suggest that he has received scalp swelling on left parietal region of head. It is

Court of District and Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraoul(Darbhanga)

Present:- Sri Shiv Kumar,

Dist.&Addl. Sess. Judge, Biraoul.

BP No. 136/2026(Ranjeet Chaupal vs. State of Bihar)

Page No. 3 of 3

dangerous for brain, it is grievous in nature. The investigation in this case is still going on and iota of evidence is yet to come. Considering the discussions made above, nature of allegation, injury reports of injured, as well as other facts and circumstances of the case this Court does not feel inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage. Accordingly the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

(Shiv Kumar)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraoul

23.07.2026