

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 513/ 2026

Choudhari Das and Others Vs. The State of Bihar
Dharhara P.S. Case No. 45/2026

15.06.2026

1. The present anticipatory bail application has been preferred by petitioners **1. Choudhari Das**, s/o- Narayan Das , **2. Laxmi Devi**, w/o- Choudhari Das, **3. Sajjan Kumar**, s/o- Choudhari Das and **4. Lal Mohan Kumar**, s/o- Choudhari Das who are apprehending arrest in connection with Dharhara P.S. Case No. 45/2026, u/ss 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 109 and 3(5) of B.N.S., pending in the Court of Ld. A.C.J.M. III, Munger.

2. The informant has alleged that all the accused persons including the petitioners with an intention to kill assaulted her husband with lathi-danda, iron rod and motorcycle chain as a result of which he suffered head injuries. Further the petitioners Laxmi Devi and Choudhari Das snatched away a gold chain, mobile phone and case amount of Rs. 2000/-. Hence the information, based on which the above stated P.S. case was registered.

3. At the outset the Ld. Counsel for the petitioners have certified that previously no anticipatory or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioners before this Court or before any other Court including the Hon'ble High Court. He also certified that **the petitioners have no criminal case pending against them**. The Ld. Counsel submits that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence and further that they have been falsely implicated in the present case. That there is an unexplained inordinate delay of three days in lodging the FIR. That no case u/s 109 and 303(2) of B.N.S. is made out against the petitioners. Therefore the Ld Counsel pleads that the petitioners be granted the privilege of pre-arrest bail.

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, MUNGER
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION No.- 513/ 2026

Choudhari Das and Others Vs. The State of Bihar
Dharhara P.S. Case No. 45/2026

4. The Ld. P.P. has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that the petitioners are the named accused of the FIR and the investigation in the case is continuing. That the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 8 and 9 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case.

5. Heard the submissions of respective Id. Counsels and perused the record of the case.

6. From perusal of the case record it seems that the petitioners are the named accused of the F.I.R. That the witnesses in their respective statements on paras 8 and 9 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. From the injury report it is apparent that the victim has suffered injuries on the vital parts of the body I.e. “cut wound oozing blood from head at two side: (a) middle side of head measuring about 3 inches X skin deep; (b) left lateral side of head measuring about 4 inches X skin deep” though the C.T scan report shows no bony injury. That the investigation in the case is continuing.

7. Therefore, considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the nature of allegations and in the totality of the facts and the circumstances of the case in my view no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. Hence, the present petition is hereby **Rejected**.

Dictated

(ALOK GUPTA)
Sessions Judge, Munger
Dated:- 15.06.2026