

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 525/2026/ Filing No. 2278/2026)**

In re:

1. Harihar Sahu Keshari @ Harihar Prasad Keshari, aged 71 years,
S/o Late Ram Nath Sahu
2. Madhuri Devi, aged 66 years,
W/o Harihar Sahu Keshari @ Harihar Prasad Keshari,
3. Alok Keshari @ Alok Kumar, aged 33 years,
S/o Harihar Sahu Keshari @ Harihar Prasad Keshari,
4. Aman Keshari, aged 19 years,
S/o Harihar Sahu Keshari @ Harihar Prasad Keshari
All R/o Vill- Bhabhua Ward No. 25 East Muhalla near Mahavir Temple, P.S.- Bhabhua,
Dist- Kaimur (Bhabua)

V/s

STATE

Complaint Case No: 265/2024

U/s: 323, 341, 379, 354(B) IPC

Date Of Order: 02.04.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Arun Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused/petitioners 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. Denying any such occurrence as alleged was ever taken place, it is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the petitioner no. 1 and 2 are daughter-in-law of the complainant and sister-in-law of petitioner no. 3 and 4 and this case has been filed with intention to put pressure to divide the property in the family and the entire allegations have been engineered to give a serious colour to the incident.
 4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
 5. Heard the arguments of both the parties and perused the case record. It transpires from perusal of record that a criminal complaint is filed by one Sheela Keshari against the petitioners and after inquiry, cognizance was taken against these petition-

ers under Section 323, 341, 379, 354B IPC. Allegations against them as per complaint are that brother in-law of complainant entered the room of complainant and misbehaved with her and thereafter, a quarrel was occurred and the hand of complainant was fractured. She further alleged that the accused/petitioners have also snatched valuables from her person and taken away Rs. 1 lakh cash. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that no such occurrence as alleged was ever taken place and complainant being daughter-in-law of petitioner no. 1 has filed this case to put pressure on the petitioners for partition of property. Petitioners are stated to have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 3 of their bail petition.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts 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