

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

Anticipatory Bail Petition (A.B.P.) No. 236/ 2026

(Arising out of Tariyani P.S. Case No. 126/2026

U/s. 329(3), 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 305, 74, 324(4), 352, 351(2), 3(5) B.N.S.)

1. Urmila Devi, aged about 52 years,
2. Haricharan Rai, aged about 55 years,
3. Kundan Rai, aged about 25 years.
4. Madhu Rai, aged about 28 years.
5. Santlal Rai, aged about 45 years.
6. Subhash Kumar, aged about 26 years.

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

Appearance -

For the Petitioners : Sri Parbhat Kumar, Advocate.

For the State : Sri Arshad Siddiqui, Addl. Public Prosecutor, Sheohar.

ORDER

30.06.2026

The learned advocate for the petitioners and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor have been heard. Perused the case diary.

This petition for grant of anticipatory bail was filed on 22.05.2026 on behalf of above-named petitioners, who apprehend arrest in connection with Tariyani P.S. Case No. 126/2026 registered under section 329(3), 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 305, 74, 324(4), 352, 351(2), 3(5) B.N.S

The prosecution's case in brief is that on 30.04.2026 at about 9 P.M., the informant was loading tent equipment on a pickup truck at his doorstep for taking to his shop when Haricharan Rai, Kundan Rai, Madhu Rai, Sonu Kumar, Raja Kumar, Rajiv Kumar, Subhash Kumar, Santlal Rai, Bharat Rai and 10-15 unknown persons, all armed with sharp and lethal weapons, arrived and blocked the road before hurling verbal abuses at the informant. It is

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

A.B.P. No. 236 / 2026

Urmila Devi & Anrs. Vs. State of Bihar

ORDER

30.06.2026 further alleged that the assailants damaged the informant's pickup truck, and Kundan Kumar and Madhu Rai struck at his left hand with a *lathi*, causing fracture. Subsequently, the group surrounded and assaulted him and also struck the informant's cousin Arun Chaudhary on his head with an iron rod, which resulted in serious injury and bleeding, and losing consciousness. It is lastly alleged that the assailants also entered the informant's house and removed Rs. 60,000/- in cash and various gold ornaments from his wife, and Pintu Chaudhary misbehaved with her. The assailants also threatened the informant with death before leaving his house.

It has been averred at the outset in para 2 of the petition that the petitioners have not filed any anticipatory bail petition pending before this Court or in High Court, Patna, and in para 3 that the petitioner no. 1, 2,3, and 4 have criminal antecedent and petitioner no. 5 and 6 have no criminal antecedent. It is further argued that the petitioners were innocent and falsely implicated due to village politics and previous enmity. As a matter of fact, both the sides were neighbour and the offences except under section 74 and 305 B.N.S. were bailable and there was no specific allegation against the petitioners. Therefore it is prayed that the petitioners may be granted anticipatory bail. The learned A.P.P. has opposed the bail petition.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the petitioners are named as accused in the F.I.R. and the allegations have been supported by the informant and three other witnesses in their statements as recorded during the investigation. The injury reports recorded in the case diary (para 34, 41) and also separately enclosed, reveal that the informant has suffered pain all over body and abrasion on forearm whereas his cousin Arun Chaudhary suffered lacerated wound on right parietal scalp, both of which are simple and caused

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 236 / 2026
Urmila Devi & Anrs. Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

30.06.2026 by hard and blunt substance. As pointed out, the allegations against the petitioners are general and omnibus, and in any case, not supported with evidence with respect to offence of theft and molestation- which are the only non-bailable charges found true in this case in the supervision (para 27).

In view of the above facts and circumstances, I find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. As such, the prayer is **allowed**. The petitioners are accordingly directed to be released in the event of arrest/surrender within **two weeks** of the receipt of this order, upon furnishing bail bonds of **Rs.10,000** with **two sureties of like amount each** to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, subject to the **terms of section 482 (3) B.N.S.S.**

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

(Dictated & Corrected)

Sd/-

Addl. Sessions Judge, IV
Sheohar