

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & A.S.J.-II, VAISHALI AT HAJIPUR

A.B.P. NO. 2070 of 2025

CNR No. BRVA01-007010-2025

Arising out Sarai P.S. Case No. 37/2025

U/S- 87 of B.N.S.

=====
(1) Sonu Kumar, S/o: Sukan Das

(2) Chanda Devi, W/o: Sonu Kumar

.....

Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

.....

Opposite Party

=====
Appearance :

For the petitioner

: Sri Vinod Rai, Dharmendra Kumar, Ld. Adv.

For the State

: Sri Ramnath Mahto, Ld. A.P.P.

19.03.2026

Order

1. The anticipatory bail petition of the petitioners- **1) Sonu Kumar,(2) Chanda Devi** who are apprehending their arrest in connection with aforesaid case, **Sarai P.S. Case No. 37/2025, U/S- 87 of B.N.S.**

2. The Ld. Advocate on behalf of the petitioners pressed the anticipatory bail petition and submitted that earlier the petitioners have not filed any bail application either anticipatory or regular before this Ld. Court or the Hon'ble High Court. That the petitioners have no any other criminal antecedent. That on the basis of statement U/s 180 of B.N.S.S. the police wanted to arrest the petitioners. That the petitioners are innocent has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case due to pattidari dispute. That the fact remains that informant and the petitioners are close pattidar which will be clean from the G.T. given below that since there is dispute been the petitioner's father and mother with his other close pattidar one Raghunandan Das whose wife Sita Devi has lodged Sarai P.S. Case No. 23/2021, U/Ss 341, 323, 354, 379/34 of I.P.C. who has managed the informant and victim and changed the statement of victim against the statement of original F.I.R. G.T. is given below:-

<p><u>19.03.2026</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Dukhit Das /</p> <hr/> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">/</td> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">/</td> <td style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">/</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Dewari Das</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Jhapash Das</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Keshi Das</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Sukan Das</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Raghunandan Das</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Birju Das</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td style="text-align: center;">W/ Sita Devi</td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Sonu Kumar</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Hira Das</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">/</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Chanda Devi</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Kajal Kumari</td> </tr> </table> <p>That the petitioner no.1 is Bhaisur of the victim and has never been taken away the victim anywhere. That the petitioner no.2 is elder cousin Gotani of victim also. That the petitioners have apprehension of their arrest in connection with the present case. That the petitioners are law abiding citizen and they are ready to furnish sound bail bonds of local bailors.</p> <p>3. The Ld. A.P.P. opposed the anticipatory bail petition, and submitted that there is direct and specific allegations against these petitioners, and further investigation is still going on.</p> <p>4. As per written statement of the informant-Hira Das, the prosecution's case in short is that, he was away in Nagpur and his wife Kajal Kumari has been missing since 08:30 pm. On 06.02.2025. Informant came to know that she used to talk to a boy on mobile and has disappeared with the same boy. The boy's name is Sanjeev Kumar, and his mobile no. is 9162582269, and informant's wife mobile no. is 9031559197, and she also uses whats app no. 9122123019, she has run away with Rs. 5,000/- cash and gold jewellery worth approximately Rs. 40,000/-</p> <p>5. Heard both the parties, Perused the L.C.R. and available C.D. In C.D. Para-2 re-statement of informant has mentioned, he supported his case. In C.D. Para-6 witness Sunaina Devi's statement is mentioned, she supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-7 witness Muneshwar Das's statement is mentioned, he supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-16, it is</p>	/	/	/	Dewari Das	Jhapash Das	Keshi Das	/	/	/	Sukan Das	Raghunandan Das	Birju Das	/	W/ Sita Devi	/	Sonu Kumar		Hira Das	/		/	Chanda Devi		Kajal Kumari
/	/	/																							
Dewari Das	Jhapash Das	Keshi Das																							
/	/	/																							
Sukan Das	Raghunandan Das	Birju Das																							
/	W/ Sita Devi	/																							
Sonu Kumar		Hira Das																							
/		/																							
Chanda Devi		Kajal Kumari																							

19.03.2026

mentioned that, when police reached Hira Das's house and asked about victim Kajal Kumari, then he told that he had received a call from Kajal Kumari, who had told that a man named Sonu Kumar had lured her and imprisoned her somewhere in Gujarat. In C.D. Para-19 victim Kajal Kumari's statement U/s 180 B.N.S.S. is mentioned, she said that two years ago she met Sonu Kumar in relative's wedding, he gave his no. and she used to talk to him. One day he lured her away on the pretext of getting her a job, but tricked her and taking her to Gujarat. He forced to work there and tried to force physical relations with her, she resisted, but he beat her and forcefully make a relations with her by raping her. She somehow managed to return home, Sonu Kumar, his mother-father, and his wife Chanda Devi came to her home and assaulted the victim and her husband. In C.D. Para-37 victim Kajal Kumari's statement U/s 183 B.N.S.S. is mentioned, in which she fully supported her case. In C.D. Para-42 supervision report of S.D.P.O. Sadar 2, Lalganj is mentioned, according to this the case is found true against these accused-petitioners along with other co-accused. In C.D. Para-81 the accused-petitioners are absconding. Further investigation is still going on.

6. Hence, in the light of above said, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to these accused-petitioners, the same is hereby, **Rejected.**

7. O/C will send the copy of this order along with L.C.R. to concerned Ld. Court below for kind information and needful.

8. The Steno is directed to upload the order on the C.I.S.

District & Addl. Sessions Judge-II,
Vaishali at Hajipur,
19.03.2026