

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44122 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-394 Year-2024 Thana- BANJARIA District- East Champaran

Sima Devi Wife of Ravindra Sah @ Ravindra Kumar Resident of village -
Daroga tola, Ps- Banjariya, Dist- East champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

- 2 16-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Banjariya P.S. Case No.394/2024, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(2), 109,
352, 3(5) of the B.N.S. Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman. It is
next submitted that husband of the petitioner had approached
this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc.
No.32639/2025 and the same was allowed by an order dated
22.05.2025. It is next submitted that informant alleges that
husband of the petitioner was indulged in trade of liquor, further
on 26.11.2024, the Banjariya police caught the liquor of her



husband, on account of which, the husband of the petitioner abused the informant alleging that it was at his instance that the liquor was caught, thereafter husband of the petitioner assaulted the informant by knife causing injury. It is next alleged that this petitioner along with co-accused Vivek Kumar also assaulted the brother of the informant Vinod Sah by knife causing injury. It is submitted that the injury suffered by Vinod Sah is simple in nature.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner along with Vivek are alleged to have assaulted Vinod by knife causing injury. It is also submitted that Vinod suffered two injuries and the husband of the petitioner has been granted the privilege of regular bail, as such, the learned APP submits that it is not a fit case, where the privilege of anticipatory bail be granted to the petitioner, in the nature of allegation as alleged in the FIR.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.



7. However, if the petitioner surrenders on or before 30.07.2025, in that event, the learned trial Court shall dispose of the case, on the same day, keeping in mind that husband of the petitioner has been granted the privilege of regular bail by this Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

