

In the court of District & Addl. Sessions Judge 1st, Bagaha, West Champaran.

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 183/2026

Registration No.-183/2026

(Arising out of Bathwariya P.S.Case No. -109/2025)

**1.Ramashish Khatik alias Ashish Khatik, age-25 years, s/o-Daroga Khatik,
r/o Tribhauni, P.S-Bhaironanj, District-West Champaran.....Petitioner**

vs

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

11.05.2026 Petitioner 1.Ramashish Khatik alias Ashish Khatik apprehends his arrest in connection with Bathwariya P.S.Case No. 109/2025 registered u/s-137(2),140(3),103,238,61(2),3(5)BNS pending in the learned Court of the ACJM-II Bagaha and has filed the present anticipatory bail petition which has been pressed today. Copy of the same has been served to the learned P.P In-charge for the state.

Sri C.K.Pathak, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Sri Prabhu Prasad, learned P.P.In-charge for State assisted by Sri Indubhushan Pandey, learned counsel on behalf of the informant are present before the Court.

The prosecution case in brief as narrated in the written application of the informant namely Sagar Ram is that his daughter Sangeeta Devi was married to Ranjeet Ram at Vishunpurwa, Bibi Bankatwa Bathwariya according to the Hindu customs and rites about five years ago. It has been stated that Sanjeet Ram and his family members used to torture her. Informant talked to his daughter last time on 25.11.2025 thereafter her mobile phone was switched off. When informant came at the matrimonial house of his daughter, he could not find her with her six year old child. It has been further stated that accused persons named in FIR under a conspiracy had hid them. In course of investigation informant's daughter was found dead. On the basis of application of the informant, present case was registered.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he is quite innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has been falsely implicated in this case. Earlier no other bail application on behalf of the petitioner has been filed either before this court or any superior court. Petitioner is also named in Mahila P.S.Case No.27/2020 registered u/s-323,341,427,504,506/34 IPC. It has been submitted that petitioner is not named in FIR rather his name appeared in course of investigation in confessional statement of co-accused Deepak Ram who has already been granted regular bail by the predecessor of this Court. Petitioner is auto driver and he was hired by co-accused Deepak Ram keeping him in dark. Petitioner has no complicity in the alleged occurrence rather deceased was killed by the co-accused Ranjeet Ram(husband of the deceased). Co-accused Deepak Ram and Babul Lal Ram have already been granted bail by BP No.180/2026 and BP No.183/2026 respectively. Offences leveled against the petitioner are not applicable. Hence, he may kindly granted privilege of anticipatory bail.

On other other hand learned P.P In-charge for state assisted by learned counsel on behalf of the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that is petitioner is co-villager of co-accused Deepak Ram and he is involved in disposal of dead body of the deceased in association with other co-accused persons. As per postmortem report cause of death is pressure over neck. In view of nature and gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve privilege of anticipatory bail.

Continue**11.05.2026**

Heard the parties and perused the FIR and case diary and other materials available on record. Petitioner's name in this case appeared in course of investigation in confessional statement of co-accused Deepak Ram as contained in paragraph no.108 of case diary. Petitioner is co-villager of Deepak Ram. There is allegation against the petitioner to dispose the dead body of the deceased in association with other co-accused persons for which petitioner's auto-rickshaw was used. Postmortem report shows cause of death is antemortem pressure over neck. Petitioner is also named in Mahila P.S. Case No.27/2020 registered u/s-323,341,427,504,506/34 IPC. Investigation of the case is still pending.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and material available on record as discussed above coupled with nature and gravity of offence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated & Corrected)

(Manish Dwivedi)
District & Addl. Sessions Judge 1st

Date of order	11.05.2026
Date of Reserving order	11.05.2026
Uploading date	19.05.2026
Uploaded by	Kamlesh Kumar(O.C, DASJ-I)

