

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.2646 of 2026.

1. Baban Rai
 2. Raju Kumar
 3. Dipu Kumar
- Petitioners.

Versus
The State of Bihar

**Order
No.**

Date

O R D E R

02 18-06-2026

1. The **three petitioners**, who are family members, seek anticipatory bail in connection with **Digha P.S. Case No. 442 of 2026**, disclosing offences under Sections 110, 115(2), 126(2), 303(2), 351(2), 352, read with Section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).
2. The prosecution case, as alleged in the written report of the informant, namely Dilip Kumar is that, on 20.05.2026 at around 7:00 AM when a dispute arose between his neighbours, Munna Kumar and Raju Kumar, over the parking of a motorcycle, the informant attempted to intervene and pacify them. Raju Kumar (petitioner no. 2) allegedly threatened him with dire consequences, stating that he would deal with him later. The informant, who works as a *munsi* at Digha Polson Road, further alleged that on the following day, i.e., 21.05.2026 at about 10:45 AM, Raju Kumar (petitioner no. 2), accompanied by his cousin Dipu Kumar (petitioner no. 3) and Baban Rai (petitioner no. 1), arrived at his workplace pursuant to a conspiracy and assaulted him. It is alleged that Raju Kumar struck the informant on the head with an iron rod, causing bleeding injuries. Dipu Kumar allegedly snatched the gold chain from the informant's neck, while Baban Rai took Rs. 20,000/- from his pocket. As a result of the assault, the informant sustained injuries to his head, hands, and legs, and was subsequently taken to Danapur Sub-Divisional Hospital for medical treatment.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the only non-bailable offences alleged are under Sections 110 and 303(2) of the BNS, carrying a maximum punishment of seven years' imprisonment. He further contends that the allegations of assault against petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 3 are general and omnibus in nature, whereas the accusation against petitioner no. 2, Raju Kumar, is specific, alleging

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.2646 of 2026.

Contd....
(18-06-2026)

that he struck the informant on the head with an iron rod. Learned counsel argues that the FIR itself reveals that the genesis of the dispute was trivial, and in this background, the petitioners, being neighbours, have been falsely implicated. Moreover, the petitioners are stated to have clean antecedents.

4. For a proper adjudication of the present anticipatory bail application, the office is directed to **requisition the case diary** and the criminal antecedents of the accused-petitioners from the Investigating Officer.
5. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners prays for interim protection from arrest pending further proceeding.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case; the nature of the offences and the punishment prescribed upon conviction; submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioners; and their clean criminal antecedents, this Court is inclined to grant ***interim protection from arrest*** to the petitioners ***until the next date*** of hearing in connection with **Digha P.S. Case No. 442 of 2026**. The petitioners are directed to cooperate with the Investigating Officer and remain available to the police as and when required.
7. Re-list on 04.07.2026 for further consideration.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rupesh Deo)
Sessions Judge, Patna

Date of Order	18-06-2026
Date of Reserving Order	NA
Uploading Date	18-06-2026
Uploaded by	Amjad/-