

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE
DISTRICT-GOPALGANJ

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 866 of 2026

(Arising out of Vijaipur P.S. Case No. 212 of 2021, registered U/S 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 327, 384, 452, 504 and 506 of the I.P.C.)

In the matter of :-

Name of the petitioner	: Anjali Devi.
F.I.R. U/S	: 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 327, 384, 452, 504 and 506 of the I.P.C.
Charge-Sheet U/S	: Not submitted.
Counsel for the Petitioner	: Shri Upendra Kushwaha, ld. Adv.
Counsel for the State	: Shri Deo Vansh Giri, ld. P.P.

O r d e r.

09-06-2026

1. This Anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named accused-petitioner, who is apprehending her arrest in connection with Vijaipur P.S. Case No. 212 of 2021, registered U/S 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 327, 384, 452, 504 and 506 of the I.P.C., is put up for hearing.

2. As per the FIR, prosecution case in brief is that on the basis of written application of the informant, Vijaipur P.S. Case No. 212 of 2021 has been lodged against the petitioner and others. It is inter alia alleged in the F.I.R. that on 10-10-2021 at about 11:30 am, when informant went to his house, meanwhile petitioner along with other accused persons arrived there armed with Gandasi, rod, lathi-danda and knife and while abusing demanded extortion of Rs. 2 Lakh. When informant forbade, accused Nanhe Sahu to assault the informant, over which all the accused persons started assaulting him with lathi-danda and Gandase. It is alleged that accused Nanhe Sahu inflicted Gandasi blow on the head of the informant and he sustained bleeding injury on his head and accused Brajesh Sahu inflicted knife blow upon him and in order to save himself, he sustained cut injury in his left hand. Meanwhile, accused Pappu Sahu attacked on the back of the informant with rod and he fell down. It is alleged that other accused persons assaulted the informant with danda and he sustained injuries in his body.

3. It is submitted on behalf of accused/petitioner that she is innocent and has committed no offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. It is further submitted that no case U/S 307 and 327 I.P.C. is made out against the petitioner and there is no specific allegation against the petitioner. It is further submitted that there is land dispute between the parties. It is lastly submitted that co-accused Nanhe Sahu and Others have been granted anticipatory bail in A.B.P. No. 251/22. On such strength, prayer for anticipatory bail has been made by the petitioner.

4. Heard ld. Counsel for the petitioner as well as ld. P.P. for the State. Ld. P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the accused-petitioner.

5. Having heard both the parties and perused the case record along with case diary. From the perusal of the F.I.R. as well as case diary, it transpires that although, petitioner is named in the F.I.R. but there is no specific allegation attributed against her rather the allegation against her is general and omnibus. From perusal of para-5 of the case diary, it appears that during the course of

(2/2)

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 866 of 2026

(Contd./09-06-2026)

investigation, it was found that occurrence took place between the parties due to previous land dispute and allegation of demanding extortion of Rs. 2 Lakh is ornamental. Para-10 of the case diary shows that petitioner has got one criminal antecedent. From perusal of para-12 of the case diary, it appears that during the course of investigation, villagers disclosed that there is land dispute between the parties. Although, independent witnesses at para-13 and 14 of the case diary have supported the case of the prosecution but occurrence has taken place between the parties due to previous land dispute between the parties. From perusal of the record, it appears that some co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail and the petitioner is a woman.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of this case, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is allowed. It is accordingly ordered that in the event of arrest or surrender before the Id. Court-below within 30 days from the date of this order, the above named petitioner shall be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Id. Court-below subject to conditions as laid down U/S 482(2) B.N.S.S. **subject to conditions that one of the bailors shall be close relative of the petitioner and one shall be local with further condition that she will file an undertaking that she will cooperate in the investigation/trial and she will not temper with the evidence.**

Let a copy of this order along with lower court record be sent to the Id. Lower Court for information and needful and the order be uploaded on CIS immediately.

(Dictated)

(Geeta Gupta)
Principal Sessions Judge, Gopalganj.