

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

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 2918 of 2025 (Naubatpur P.S. Case No. 756/2025)

1. Anju Devi, aged abt. 44 years, w/o Sudhir Kumar,
2. Sudhir Kumar, aged abt. 47 years, s/o Shiv Kumar Verma, r/o- Lodipur, P.S. Naubatpur, Distt. Patna.
3. Dinesh Kumar, aged abt. 48 years, s/o Late Ram Bharosha Verma,
4. Mukesh Kumar, aged abt. 48 years, s/o Rajeshwar Prasad Verma, r/o vill. Andhra Chauki, P.S. Bikram, Distt. Patna

Vs. Petitioners

The State of BiharO.P.

Lawyer for the accused; Sri Rajesh Kumar Sinha (Adv.)

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

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

ORDER

| | | |
|------------|--|--------|
| 03.03.2026 | <p>1. The present application has been preferred on behalf of the petitioners named above, apprehending their arrest in connection with Naubatpur P.S. Case No. 756 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 140(3), 140(2), 318(4), 322, 338, 336(3) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.</p> <p>2. The prosecution story is that, a complaint Petition No. 365 of 2025, by the complainant, Shanti Devi @ Shanti Kumari, filed before the Court of Ld. ACJM 1st Danapur, which was sent by the Ld. ACJM 1st Danapur to Naubatpur Police Station u/s 175(3), upon which a Naubatpur P.S. Case No. 756/2025 dated 12.12.2025 was registered against all the four accused petitioners. As per the complain petition the prosecution case in brief is that, the complainant's mother was living alone at her residence and the complainant as her only legal heir used to visit her parental home at regular interval. She came to know that, accused Anju Devi and her husband Sudhir Kumar used to visit her mother's home and somehow influenced her mother and fraudulently got the landed property registered in their names. It is further alleged that the other two petitioners were the signatories of the said documents.</p> | Contd. |
|------------|--|--------|

Contd.
06.03.2026

3. The Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent, have committed no offence and have been falsely implicated. From the face of FIR itself no case against these petitioners is prima facie attracted. The mother of the complainant had voluntarily executed the alleged sale deed in favour of the petitioner no. 01 and 02. No any inducement, threat or coercion has ever been caused to the alleged vendor by any of the accused petitioners. They are ready to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence pray to be enlarged on bail.
4. Per contra, learned Additional Public Prosecutor has strongly opposed the prayer for bail. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioners are very serious in nature, therefore do not deserve any leniency.
5. I have given my anxious consideration to the rival submissions and perused the case diary. Admittedly, the mother of the complainant had executed a sale deed in favour of the accused petitioners. No any prima facie material of any offence u/s 140,318,336 or 338 of BNS has been brought on record during the course of investigation. The dispute prima facie appears to be civil in nature. Therefore, I am of the considered view that, the petitioners deserve the privilege of pre arrest bail in this case.
6. Accordingly, in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from today, the petitioner, (1) Anju Devi, (2) Sudhir Kumar, (3) Dinesh Kumar and (4) Mukesh Kumar, shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of

Contd.

Contd.
03.03.2026

the learned court below, in connection with Naubatpur P.S. Case No. 756 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 BNSS, and further conditions that:

7. (i) The petitioners shall cooperate with the investigation/trial.
(ii) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly induce, threaten or promise any person acquainted with the facts of the case.
(iv) In case of violation of any of the conditions, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.
8. It is made clear 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.
9. Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the court concerned forthwith.

(Naghma Tarannum)

Addl. Sessions Judge-IV, Danapur