

ABP 1845/2026
IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE II,
SIWAN

Police Station – Darauli PS Case No. - 218/2026
Under Section- 126(2), 118(2) BNS.

Manisha Rajbhar V. State

ORDER

20.07.2026

This anticipatory bail petition in anticipation of arrest, is filed on behalf of the accused petitioner **Manisha Rajbhar** in connection with Darauli PS Case No. - 218/2026 registered Under Section- 126(2), 118(2) BNS., the copy of which is served upon the ld. A.P.P.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that on 16.05.2026 at about 09:00 A.M., the victim Nisha had gone to the house of her neighbour Chotelal Rajbhar for some work. It is alleged that during that time, the petitioner Premshikha @ Deepu, along with co-accused Chotelal Rajbhar, assaulted Nisha with a sharp-edged knife on her stomach, without any rhyme or reason, causing serious injuries and profuse bleeding, as a result of which she collapsed at the spot. She was immediately taken for medical treatment and was initially examined by Dr. Kanhaiya and Dr. Manoj Kumar. Thereafter, she was referred to Rajshree Hospital, Gorakhpur, where she remained admitted till 27.05.2026. As her condition did not improve, she was subsequently shifted to the emergency ward of AIIMS, Gorakhpur, where she is presently undergoing treatment. It is stated that the delay in lodging the FIR occurred as the family members were primarily concerned with saving the life of the injured and no guardian was available to approach the authorities earlier.

Sh. Om Prakash, Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no concern with the alleged incident. It is further submitted that the petitioner has got clean past having no criminal antecedent. FIR has been lodged after an unexplained delay and the allegations against the petitioner are false and fabricated. It has been prayed that the petitioner may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

Sh. Ranjan Kumar Srivastava, Learned ld. APP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the petitioner is named accused in FIR and committed serious offence and considering the nature and gravity of the allegations and the seriousness of the injuries sustained by the victim, the learned APP prayed for the rejection of the bail application.

ABP 1845/2026
IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE II,
SIWAN

Heard both the sides.

Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and having perused the material available on record, this Court finds that the prosecution witnesses recorded in C.D. Para Nos. 6, 7, 16 and 17 have supported the case of prosecution and prima facie implicated the petitioner in the alleged occurrence. Further, the supervision note contained in C.D. Para No. 51, the case has been found as true against the petitioner. The investigation material, as reflected in C.D. Parcha No. 62, also indicates that the injured is presently undergoing treatment at AIIMS, Gorakhpur.

Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the manner in which the assault was allegedly committed using a sharp-edged weapon, and the material collected during the course of the investigation, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present case is not found to be a fit case for the grant of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, considering facts and circumstances of this case having regard to submissions of both the parties, the anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of *petitioner namely **Manisha Rajbhar** is hereby **rejected***. The petitioners are directed to surrender before the Court below within 15 days of the order and the Court below shall consider the bail without being prejudiced by this order.

Copy of this order be sent to the Id. Court of Ms. Kumari Sulochana, J.M. 1st Class, Siwan.

Sd/-
(Shashi Kant Rai)
ASJ II, Siwan
20.07.2026