

In The Court Of 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Muzaffarpur**A.B.P No. 429/2026****Satish Kumar Singh & Ors..... Petitioners.****Vs.****State of Bihar.....O.P.****O R D E R****16.04.2026**

This application has been filed, for grant of anticipatory bail, on behalf of the accused petitioners, namely, (1) Satish Kumar Singh (2) Shanti Devi and (3) Juli Devi, in connection with Paroo P.S. Case No. 14/2026, registered U/Ss 329(3), 126(2), 115(2), 109, 74, 303(2), 352, 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the B.N.S., pending in the Ld. Court of Ms. Arpita Sinha, J.M.F.C., Court No. 09, Muzaffarpur (West).

Heard arguments of Ld. Counsel, appearing for the accused petitioners & Ld. A.P.P. for the State.

Ld. Counsel for the accused petitioners, has submitted that previously no anticipatory or regular bail petitions of any nature, had been filed by the accused petitioners, either in this court or before the Hon'ble High Court. That the petitioners have got no criminal history. That the petitioners are quite innocent, have not committed any offence and have falsely been implicated in this case, by the informant. That the accused petitioners had not committed any assault either upon the informant or upon any of his family members and rather, the informant had taken Rs. 2 lakh as loan, from petitioner's son and when the petitioner's son asked to return back the loan amount, the informant had abused and beaten the petitioners. That entire allegations, as levelled against the petitioners, are false and fabricated. It has further been submitted that the petitioners have got genuine apprehension of their arrest in this case. Ld. counsel for the petitioners side, prays for their release on anticipatory bail.

Ld. A.P.P. for the state, opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Perused the record, including the F.I.R. and case diary, from paras no. 01 to 57. From perusal of the record, it transpires that allegations against the petitioners, namely, Shanti Devi and Juli Devi, are general and omnibus in nature and there is no specific allegation against both these petitioners, regarding assault on any vital part of the informant's son body or other persons. Thus, allegation u/s 109 of the B.N.S., does not seem to be attracted against these two petitioners. Other allegations are also common and vague in nature, so far as these two petitioners are concerned.

Considering the aforementioned facts and circumstances of the case, the

In The Court Of 1st Additional Sessions Judge, Muzaffarpur**A.B.P No. 429/2026****Satish Kumar Singh & Ors..... Petitioners.****Vs.****State of Bihar.....O.P.****Continued****16.04.2026**

prayer for anticipatory bail, to the extent of these two petitioners, is hereby **allowed**. Accordingly, in the event of their arrest or surrender within four weeks from today, the accused petitioners, namely, **Shanti Devi and Juli Devi**, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. Ten thousands) with two sureties of the like amount, each, to the satisfaction of the Ld. Court below and subject to the conditions, as laid down u/s 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S.

So far as the petitioner, namely, Satish Kumar Singh, is concerned, there is direct and specific allegation against him that he had assaulted on the head of the informant's son, by iron rod and in consequence thereof, the informant's son had sustained serious head injury and there was bleeding also, from the head of informant's son. Considering the specific allegation against this petitioner, regarding assault on a vital part of the body of informant's son, this court is not inclined to admit him to the privilege of anticipatory bail. Hence, Anticipatory Bail petition, so far as it relates to the petitioner, namely, **Satish Kumar Singh**, accordingly stands **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

1st Addl. Sessions Judge
Muzaffarpur