

# **In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-I, Danapur**

(Present:- Sri Kumar Gunjan, Addl. Sessions Judge- I, Danapur)

## **A.B.P. No. 1618 of 2026**

(Arising out of Bihta P.S. Case No. 583 of 2026)

- 1. Rahul Kumar, son of Ravindra Ray,**
- 2. Puja Kumari, daughter of Ravindra Ray,**
- 3. Suhani Kumari, daughter of Ravindra Ray,**
- 4. Tunni Kumari, daughter of Ravindra Ray,**
- 5. Sonfula Devi, wife of Ravindra Ray,**

All Resident of: Village- Narayanpur Mishrichak Bangalapar, P.S.- Bihta, Distt.- Patna  
..... Petitioners

Versus.

The State of Bihar.

..... Opp.Party

Learned counsel for the petitioners :- Sri Shashikant Kumar, (Advocate)  
Learned counsel for the informant :- Sri Anjay Kumar Gupta, (Advocate)  
Learned counsel for the State :- Sri Ramkeshwar Prasad (A.P.P.)

---

### **Order.**

**24-08-2026** This Anticipatory Bail petition has been filed on behalf of the above-named petitioners, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Bihta P.S. Case No. 583 of 2026, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 109, 117(2), 118(1), 351(2), 352, 3(5) of B.N.S., pending in the Court of learned A.C.J.M.- II, Danapur.

Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

Apart from pleading innocence, false implication, clean antecedent and this to be the first bail application of the petitioners, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that alleged Sections are bailable in nature except Section 303(2) and 109 of B.N.S., which is only a super addition to make the case serious and non-bailable. The petitioners and informant are Gotiya Patidar and they have been falsely implicated in this case due to land dispute and village politics. In the light of the above submissions, learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Learned Addl. P.P. and learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail.

Perused the record. On perusal of the record, it transpires that as far as the petitioner Puja Kumari, Suhani Kumari, Tunni Kumari and Sonfula Devi are concerned then it is to notice that they are female members of the family and there is only a general and omnibus allegation against them that all of them have abused and assaulted the informant and his wife with kicks and fists. Allegation of assault with rod is not directed against these petitioners rather it is directed only against accused Rahul Kumar. Therefore, considering these facts, **this Court is inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners Puja Kumari, Suhani Kumari, Tunni Kumari and Sonfula Devi.**

Hence, they are directed to be released, in the event of their arrest or surrender in the trial Court within Thirty (30) days from the date of this order upon their furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-with two sureties of like amount each subject to condition as

# **In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-I, Danapur**

*(P.O.:- Sri Kumar Gunjan, Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Danapur)*

**A.B.P. No. 1618 of 2026**

*(Arising out of Bihta P.S. Case No. 583 of 2026)*

*Rahul Kumar & Ors. Versus. The State of Bihar.*

-----  
**Contd.**

**24-08-2026**

- 2 -

mentioned in Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

As far as the petitioner Rahul Kumar is concerned then there is a direct allegation against him that he has assaulted the informant from an iron rod on his head leading to head injury. The injury report also suggests that lacerated wound has been sustained by the informant Anish Kumar and his father Mahendra Kumar on head, which is a vital part of the body. Informant has also submitted printed copy of the photographs showing injury on the head region. Therefore, considering these facts, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of Anticipatory Bail to this petitioner.

Accordingly, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner **Rahul Kumar**, is hereby **rejected**.

Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned Court for information and needful.

(Dictated)

**Sd./-**

(Kumar Gunjan)

Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Danapur.