

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, DANAPUR

Bail Petition No. 211 of 2026 (Bihta P.S. Case No. 70/2026)

1. Ram Kumar Nat, s/o Late Ranjan Nat,
2. Sunita Devi, w/o Ajay Nat
3. Kundan Kumar, s/o Ram Kumar Nat, All are r/o vill. Sadisopur, P.S. Bihta, Distt. Patna
..... Petitioners

Vs.

The State of BiharO.P.

Lawyer for the accused; Sri..... (Adv.)

Lawyer for the State; Sri Kalam Ansari (Addl. P.P.),

Present: - Nagma Tarannum Addl. Sessions Judge-04, Danapur

ORDER

06.03.2026

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the petitioners who are in judicial custody since 24.01.2026 in connection with Bihta P.S. Case No. 70 of 2026, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 333, 109, 74, 303, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. The prosecution case, as disclosed from the typed complaint submitted by the informant Nagvanti Devi before the S.H.O., Bihta on 21.01.2026, in brief, is that on 20.01.2026 at about 9:00 P.M., accused Rohit Nat allegedly entered the house of the informant and attempted to outrage her modesty by luring her. Upon resistance, it is alleged that the other accused persons, namely Kundan Nat, Ram Kumar Nat, Savitri Devi, Ajay Nat and Sunita Devi, arrived, abused the informant and assaulted her blind husband and other family members. There is a specific allegation against Rohit Nat and Kundan Nat of assaulting the husband of the informant with the butt of pistols causing injuries. It is further alleged that the accused persons took away certain jewellery articles from the informant.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated due to a long-standing family dispute. It is

Contd.

Contd.
06.03.2026

contended that the parties are close relatives and the present case has been instituted to pressurize the petitioners in relation to the said dispute. It is further submitted that the allegations are vague/omnibus, investigation has substantially progressed, and no custodial interrogation is required. The petitioners undertake to cooperate with the investigation/trial and abide by any condition imposed by this Court.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail, submitting that the allegations are serious in nature.
5. I have considered the rival submissions and perused the case diary. It appears that the informant and the petitioners are closely related. The case diary reflects that no incriminating material has surfaced during investigation so far. Paragraph 45 of the case diary contains the injury reports of the alleged victims, wherein the injuries have been opined to be simple in nature. Paragraphs 54 and 55 contain statements of independent witnesses examined during investigation, who have not fully corroborated the prosecution case. Paragraph 58 indicates one criminal antecedent of the petitioners. The investigation has substantially progressed though the charge-sheet is yet to be submitted. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, further custodial interrogation of the petitioners does not appear necessary at this stage.
6. Accordingly, the bail petition is Allowed and the accused petitioners namely (1) Ram Kumar Nat, (2) Sunita Devi and (3) Kundan Kumar are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of

Contd.

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, DANAPUR

Bail Petition No. 211 of 2026 (Bihta P.S. Case No. 70/2026)

Contd.
06.03.2026

the learned court below, in connection with Bihta P.S. Case No. 70 of 2026, subject to the following conditions:

7. The petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation/trial and shall appear before the trial court on each and every date fixed unless their personal appearance is duly exempted by the court concerned.
8. The petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade such person from disclosing the facts to the Court or to the police.
9. In case of violation of any of the conditions aforesaid, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.
10. It is clarified that any observation made herein is only for the purpose of disposal of the present anticipatory bail application and shall not prejudice the trial on merits.
11. Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the court concerned forthwith.

(Naghma Tarannum)
Addl. Sessions Judge-IV, Danapur