

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

Present:- Sri Shiv Kumar,

Dist.&Addl. Sess. Judge, Biraoul.

ABP No. 332/2025

(Kalam alias Md. Kalam and others vs. State of Bihar)

Page No. 1 of 2

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

ABP No. 332 of 2025

In the matter of :-

1. Kalam alias Md. Kalam, Son of Salamat alias Md. Salamat Kujara
2. Kalim alias Md. Kalim, Son of Md. Salamat alias Md. Salamat Kujra
3. Nasim alias Md. Nasim, Son of Md. Salamat alias Md. Salamat Kujra
4. Salamat alias Md. Salamat Kujra, son of Sultan alias Md. Sultan
5. Sajira alias Sanjira Khatoon, Wife of Jalim alias Md. Kalim
6. Roshan alias Roshan Khatoon, Wife of Salamat alias Md. Salamat Kujara
7. Atika alias Atika Praween, Daughter of Hasim(W/o- Kalam alias Md. Kalam)

.....Petitioners.

Vs.

2. The State of BiharOpposite Party.

For the petitioner:- Sri Sashi Kant Rai, Ld. Advocate.

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

Order

29.04.2026 The present anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of abovenamed petitioner who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Biraoul PS case No. 107 of 2025, for the offences punishable U/Ss 126(2), 115(2), 109, 3(5) of BNS, which is pending in the Court of Ld. ACJM, Biraoul, Darbhanga.

Heard Sri Sashi Kant Rai the Ld. Counsel for the petitioners 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 Rehana Khatoon. The case of the prosecution in brief is that Md. Halim has raped informant many times in the pretext of marriage. Accused persons as named in the FIR including petitioners are also involved in this incident. On

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

Present:- Sri Shiv Kumar,

Dist.&Addl. Sess. Judge, Biraoul.

ABP No. 332/2025

(Kalam alias Md. Kalam and others vs. State of Bihar)

Page No. 2 of 2

23.03.2025 accused persons kidnapped informant and tried to sink her in the river. They also tried to throw her daughter into the river.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners are quite innocent and they have not committed any offence. The petitioners have falsely been implicated in this false case. NO such occurrence did ever take place as alleged in the FIR. 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. Counsel for State opposed the prayer for bail.

Upon considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the materials available on record this court finds para 2 of the case diary mentions restatement of informant who have supported the case and mentioned about the involvement of petitioners. Para 5, 6 of the case diary mentions statement of witnesses who too have supported the case. Considering the discussions made above, nature of allegations leveled against each of the petitioners, gravity of the offence as well as other facts and circumstances of the case this court does not feel inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

(Shiv Kumar)

Addl. Sessions Judge, Biraoul

29.04.2026