

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 666/2026/ Filing No. 2851/2026)**

In re:

1. Bhanu Yadav @ Bhanu Pratap Yadav, aged 20 years,
S/o Arun Yadav,
2. Urmila Devi, aged 42 years,
W/o Prem Yadav,
3. Bansi Yadav, aged 60 years,
S/o Late Vishundhari Yadav,
4. Rajmohini Devi, aged 52 years,
W/o Bansi Yadav,
All R/o Vill-Aatdeeh, P.S-Ramgarh, Dist-Kaimur (Bhabua)

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 77/2026
P.S : Ramgarh
U/s: 115(2),126(2),352,74,109(1),
351(2),351(3),3(5) BNS
Date Of Order: 29.04.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Gireesh 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 anticipatory 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 involvement of the petitioners in the commission of alleged occurrence, it is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that both the parties are members of the same extended family and this case is the outcome of land dispute going on between the parties for partition of ancestral property, however, the sole injury sustained by informant is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt substance and as such, it is submitted that no case for the offence under section 109 (1) of the BNS is made out whereas having similar situated allegation, co-accused Pram Yadav and another have been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide ABP no. 161 of 2026.

4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
5. Heard the arguments of both the parties and perused the case record. It transpires from the perusal of record that petitioners are FIR named and allegations against them as per FIR are that on dated 16.03.2026 at around 10:00 AM, all the FIR named accused including these petitioners came to the door of informant having lathi, danda, farsa etc in their hands and started assaulting the informant and his wife for property dispute. Informant further alleged that co-accused Prem Yadav assaulted the informant with farsa and other accused have assaulted him with lathi. The injury report of informant is mentioned in para 25 of case diary showing one head injury which is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt substance. It further transpires from case diary that petitioners no. 1 is a disabled person having 40% locomotor disability. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that allegation against these petitioners are general in nature and the informant has only one injury over his head and the co-accused against whom there is allegation of assaulting the informant is not the petitioner here. It is further submitted that from the nature of accusation as well as injury report, no case U/s 109 BNS is made out against them and the co-accused who were apprehended and remanded to custody were already granted regular bail. Petitioners are stated to have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 3 of his 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