

In the Court of Dist. & Additional Session Judge-III, Sheohar.

A.B.P. No-150/2026

Arising out of Piprahi PS Case No-89/2026

Present:-Sunil Dut

District & Additional Sessions Judge-III, Sheohar.

-
- 1. Dilip Singh, S/o Late Bhagwan Singh, Aged-about 52 years,**
 - 2. Golu Singh, S/o Manoj Singh, Aged-about 26 years,**
 - 3. Raja Singh, S/o Dilip Singh, Aged-about 30 years, All are R/o Vill-Ratanpur, PS-Piprahi, Dist-Sheohar (Bihar)..... (Petitioners)**

V /s

State Of Bihar.....(Opposite Party)

On behalf of State-Md. Arshad Siddque (Ld. APP)

On behalf of defense- Sri Madhukant Pandey (Ld. Advocate)

Dated-16.04.2026

Order

The petitioners above named are apprehending their arrest in connection with Piprahi PS Case No.-89/2026, Dated-20.03.2026, U/s-126(2), 127(2), 121(1), 121(2), 109, 74, 132, 190, 191(1), 191(3) of BNS have been pressed today for hearing. Copy of the petition has already been served to Ld. APP for the state.

Heard Sri Madhukant Pandey, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and Md. Arshad Siddque Ld. APP for the state and perused the case record.

The prosecution story as per FIR in brief is that on 20.03.2026, Sub-Inspector Gautam Kumar of Piprahi PS was posted as Officer-in-Charge and was performing official duties at the police station. At about 09:00 O'clock, he received confidential information from a reliable source that in connection with Piprahi P.S. Case No. 53/26, the named accused persons, namely Dilip Singh **(Petitioner no.-1)** and Raja Singh **(Petitioner no.-3)**, were present at the house of Ashok Kumar Singh situated in village Ratanpur along with their associates. On receipt of the said information, the informant duly informed his superior officer and, after making necessary station diary entry, proceeded towards the place of occurrence along with a police team and other police personnel in a government vehicle at about 09:15 O'clock for the purpose of arresting the accused persons and taking lawful action. At about 09:30 O'clock, upon reaching

Continued.....

Continued.....

16.04.2026

near the house of Ashok Kumar Singh, the informant found both the named accused persons present there. When the police party caught them, a mob of about 30–35 persons, all being associates of the accused, assembled there unlawfully and, in furtherance of their common object, started abusing the police personnel in filthy language and obstructed them from discharging their official duties. It is further alleged that the said unlawful assembly, armed with Lathi, Danda and stones, suddenly launched a violent attack upon the police party with intent to kill, causing injuries to several police personnel. The female constables were also subjected to assault and misbehave. On seeing the arrival of reinforcement, all the persons fled away from the spot. During the course of the incident, one running person, namely Vikki Singh was apprehended at the spot, who disclosed the names of some other co-accused persons involved in the occurrence. On the basis of identification made by him, local *chaukidar*, and other police personnel as well as the arrested accused, the following persons were found involved in the commission of the offence namely, Dhananjay Kunwar, Vikram Kunwar, Shivam Kunwar, Dilip Singh (**Petitioner no.-1**), Golu Singh (**Petitioner no.-2**), Raja Singh s/o Dilip Singh(**Petitioner no.-3**), Ashok Kumar Singh, Shani Singh, Akhilesh Singh, Raja Singh s/o Jay Prakash Singh, Vinay Singh and 20–25 unknown persons. The accused persons, being members of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object, committed rioting, voluntarily caused hurt to police personnel, obstructed public servants in discharge of their official duties, used criminal force, facilitated the escape of accused persons from lawful custody, and attempted to snatch government arms. The apprehended accused Vikki Singh was taken into custody following due procedure and forwarded to judicial custody. The injured police personnel were sent for medical examination and treatment at Community Health Centre, Piprahi. Accordingly FIR was instituted.

Ld. Counsel appearing for the petitioners have submitted in para-2 of their anticipatory bail petition that no other anticipatory or regular bail application has been

Continued.....

Continued.....

16.04.2026

filled before this Court as well as before Hon'ble High Court Patna. Petitioner no.-2 has **no any criminal antecedent** and petitioner **no.-1 and 3** have got **one criminal antecedent** as mentioned in para-3 of their anticipatory bail petition. The FIR has been registered against the petitioners under non-bailable sections of BNS due to which, in view of the possibility of their being arrested by the police or being sent to judicial custody on appearing before the court. The petitioners are absolutely innocent and have not committed any crime and have been falsely implicated in the present case at the behest of enemies with the intention of putting criminal pressure on them due to dirty village politics.

Per contra Ld. APP vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioners for bail and submitted that petitioners are habitual offenders, **there are series of criminal antecedent against the petitioner no. 01 and 03 and one criminal antecedent against petitioner no. 01** but they have intentionally and deliberately concealed their criminal antecedent. They does not deserve the privilege of prearrest bail and prayed to reject the anticipatory bail petition.

Heard both sides and perused the case record.

On perusal of the case record it appears that FIR has been lodged U/s 126(2), 127(2), 121(1), 121(2), 109, 74, 132, 190, 191(1), 191(3) of BNS. The allegation has been made against petitioners for committing assault to public servant, causing grievous hurt attempt to murder, misbehaving women police personnel, using abusive and filthy language. From perusal of the case record it appears that the witnesses at para no-2, 3, 4, 5, 32, 33, 34, 35 and 38 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. There is a specific allegation against petitioner no-01 and 03 and petitioner no-02 is also alleged to committed the offense along with the mob. From further perusal of para-62 of case diary it appears that the **petitioner no.1 Dilip Singh has seven criminal antecedent**, 1. Piprahi PS Case No.-143/2020, dated-19.07.2020, 2. Piprahi PS Case No.-208/2021, dated-20.10.2021, 3. Piprahi PS Case No.-44/2023, dated-09.03.2023, 4. Piprahi PS

Continued.....

Continued.....

16.04.2026

Case No.-30/2024, dated-19.02.2024, 5. Piprahi PS Case No.-29/2022, dated-06.02.2022, 6. Piprahi PS Case No.-173/2019, dated-08.10.2019, and 7. Piprahi PS Case No.-53/2026, dated-05.03.2026 and **petitioner no.-3 Raja Singh has eight criminal antecedent**, 1. Piprahi PS Case No.-143/2020, dated-19.07.2020, 2. Piprahi PS Case No-44/2023, dated-09.03.2023, 3. Piprahi PS Case No.-30/2024, dated-19.02.2024, 4. Piprahi PS Case No.-29/2022, dated-06.02.2022, 5. Piprahi PS Case No.-173/2019, dated-08.10.2019, 6. Piprahi PS Case No.-53/2026, dated-05.03.2026, 7. Piprahi PS Case No.-162/2020, dated-09.08.2020, and 8. Piprahi PS Case No.-28/2026, dated-30.01.2026 and **petitioner no.-2 Golu Singh has one criminal antecedent** Piprahi PS Case No-44/2023, dated-09.03.2023. But on perusal of the anticipatory bail petition which is supported with an affidavit it appears that it is mentioned in the para-3 on the bail petition that petitioner no-01 Dilip Singh and Raja Singh, who are father and son only one criminal antecedent and petitioner no-02 have clean antecedent, which is **concealment of fact** before the Court. It's well known *maxim that "he who seeks equity must come with clean hand"* and it appears that the petitioners have deliberately and intentionally concealed their criminal antecedent who are habitual offenders. Petitioners does not deserve the privilege of prearrest bail. The investigation is still pending.

Considering the above facts and circumstances of the present case, **series of criminal antecedent** against the petitioner no.-1 and 3 and also **one criminal antecedent** against petitioner no-02, **concealment of fact**, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the above named petitioners. Hence the anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of petitioner no-01 Dilip Singh, petitioner no-02 Golu Singh, petitioner no-03 Raja Singh are here by **dismissed.**

Dictated

Sd/-

(Sunil Dutt)

District & Additional Sessions Judge-III,
Sheohar.

Dated-16.04.2026