

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 1335/2026/ Filing No. 6425/2026)**

In re:

1. Nagendra Ram, aged 56 years,
S/o Late Lachari Ram,
2. Budhu Ram, aged 80 years,
S/o Late Lachari Ram,
3. Bhanu Ram, aged 20 years,
S/o Budhu Ram,
4. Ajay Ram, aged 31 years,
S/o Budhu Ram,
5. Rajmui Devi, aged 35 years,
W/o Budhu Ram @ Nagendra Ram,
6. Sunita Devi @ Anita Devi, aged 26 years,
W/o Ajay Ram,
All R/o Vill-Basuhari, P.S-Belaon, Dist-Kaimur (Bhabua)
7. Sanjay Ram @ Ram Chandra Ram, aged 40 years,
S/o Mathuri Ram,
R/o Vill-Mion, P.S-Sonhan, Dist-Kaimur (Bhabua)

V/s

STATE

FIR No: 85/2026

P.S : Belaon

**U/s: 126(2),115(2),117(2),109(1),
352,351(2)(3),74,76,3(5)BNS**

Date Of Order:18.08.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Arun Kumar Gupta, 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 17.06.2026 at around 12:00 PM, the informant along with his mother-in-law were sitting at the door of her house, in the meantime, all the named accused including these petitioners came having lathi, danda, iron rod etc. in their hands and accused Ajay Ram assaulted the informant with iron rod and accused Deepak Ram disrobed her and when her mother-in-law raised alarm, accused Nagendra Ram assaulted her mother-in-law with khanti and

when her husband and son came to their rescue, all the accused persons have assaulted them and the accused persons have also snatched jewelry articles from their persons.

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. It is further submitted that there is case and counter case between the parties related to this occurrence. It is further submitted that no case U/s 109, 74 and 76 BNS is made out against these petitioners. It is therefore, prayed that the bail petition may please be allowed.
5. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.
6. 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 are that they along with other named accused have assaulted and injured the informant and her family members. The injury report of the injured are attached with case diary showing injuries to them are simple in nature caused by hard and blunt object. It is submitted that on behalf of petitioners that an altercation was broken out between the parties on the date of occurrence for which cross FIR is lodged by them against each other and both sides have received injuries in the quarrel. It is further submitted that all the injured from both sides have discharged from hospital after treatment. It is further submitted that from the nature of accusation read with injury report, no case U/s 109 BNS is made out against these petitioners and accusation of misbehaving and disrobing appears to be super addition. Petitioner No. 1 to 4 have one complaint case pending against them as mentioned in para 3 of their bail petition and rest petitioners have no criminal antecedent.
7. 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