

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 1329/2026/ Filing No. 6408/2026)**

In re:

1. Parvati Devi, aged 43 years,
W/o Haridwar,
2. Poonam, aged 28 years,
W/o Manoj,
3. Santosh Kumar, aged 35 years,
S/o Haridwar Ram,
4. Haridwar Ram, aged 62 years,
S/o Manehi Ram,
5. Puja Devi, aged 28 years,
W/o Santosh Kumar,
6. Kavi Ram, aged 25 years,
S/o Haridwar Ram,
7. Manoj Ram, aged 44 years,
S/o Haridwar Ram,
R/o Vill- Rasulpur Karmahari Ward No. 1 Nagar Panchayat, P.S- Mohania, Distt.-Kaimur (Bhabua).

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 315/2026
PS : Mohania
U/s: 126(2),115(2),303(2),74,352,
351(3),3(5)BNS
Date Of Order: 19.08.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Amit Kumar Pandey, 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. The case of prosecution is that on dated 10.05.2026 in the morning, the informant was working at her house, in the meantime, all the seven named accused entered her house and started assaulting her with lathi, dand etc. and disrobed her and taken away cash and jewelry article from her house.
 4. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that they are innocent, have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in this case due to enmity and quarrelsome nature of informant who is habitual in lodging FIRs, who has lodged more than a dozen of cases against innocent persons. It is further submitted that all the sections in which offence was stated to be committed

are bailable except section 303(2) and 74 BNS which is not attracted against the petitioner. It is, therefore, prayed that their anticipatory bail petition may please be allowed.

5. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.
6. Heard both the parties and perused the case record. Petitioners are FIR named and allegation against them are that these petitioners entered the house of informant and assaulted and disrobed her and taken away valuable from her house. It transpires from perusal of case diary that the dispute between the parties is due to drainage water moving near the house of informant. The injury report of the informant is attached with case diary showing no visible injury on the body. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the informant is a habitual litigant and use to file criminal cases against the persons on very trivial issues. Petitioners have criminal antecedents as mentioned in para 3 of their bail petition in which they are stated to be on bail.
7. 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