

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 441/2026/ Filing No. 1869/2026)**

In re:

1. Lalu Sah, aged 86 years,
S/o Late Chaturi Sah,
2. Prince Kumar @ Prince Sah, aged 19 years,
S/o Ram Pravesh Sah,
3. Sangeeta Devi, aged 47 years,
W/o Ram Pravesh Sah,
4. Ramashish Sah, aged 54 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
5. Ramji Sah, aged 53 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
6. Anish Kumar @ Anish Sah, aged 23 years,
S/o Rampravesh Sah @Rampravesh Gupta,
7. Mamta Devi, aged 51 years,
W/o Ram Pravesh Sah,
8. Laxman Sah, aged 49 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
9. Rampravesh Sah, aged 50 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
10. Ramchandra Sah, aged 60 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
11. Satyanarayan Sah, aged 30 years,
S/o Lalu Sah,
12. Arima Devi @ Neema Devi, aged 36 years,
W/o Manoj Sah,
All R/o Nahar Colony, ward no.- 5, near DM residence, P.S- Bhabua, Dist-Kaimur
(Bhabua)

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 224/2026
P.S : Bhabua
U/s: 126(2),115(2),303(2),109,
190,191(2) BNS
Date Of Order: 21.04.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Kumud Ranjan, on behalf of the accused/petitioners and Sri Shiv Shankar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and Sh. Sachidanand Rai, learned P.P. for State.

2. Petitioners have stated in para 2 of their bail petition that no other bail petition, either anticipatory or regular has been filed/pending except this, either in this court or before Hon'ble High Court at Patna.
3. Alleging false implication of the petitioners, it is submitted on their behalf that they are innocent and have falsely implicated in this case, however, both the parties are co-villagers and next door neighbours and due to differences on petty issues a simple scuffle took place between the parties for which case and counter case have lodged, however, the parties have now settle down their differences and compromise the case for which petition have been filed.
4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
5. Heard both the parties and perused the record. It transpires from the FIR that on dated 04.03.2026 at around 04:00 PM, while the informant was going to offer prayer in temple, the FIR named accused persons in naked state where playing obscene songs to which the informant objected upon which they beaten him with iron rod and injured him and when the family members of the informant came to his rescue, they were also beaten by the accused persons and snatched away gold chain and ankle pin. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that this case is the outcome of differences cropped up between the neighbours on trivial issues, however, with the interventions of well wishers of both the sides, they have compromised the case and filed compromise petition which is on record. The informant and injured persons are present in court and have stated that they have compromised the case and further stated that the injured persons have already been discharged from the hospital after treatment.
6. Considering the aforesaid fact and circumstances of the case, this anticipatory bail petition is **allowed** and in the event of their arrest or surrender within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, these petitioners shall be released on bail on their furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of trial court, subject to conditions as laid down u/s 482 of the BNSS. (Dictated)

Sd/- Anurag.
Sessions Judge