

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT AND ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV,

AURANGABAD

A.B.P. No.-1050/2026

Jamhore P.S. Case No. 22/2019

Dhananjay Kumar, Age- 30 years, S/O Sudama Singh

R/o-village- Patharkatti, P.S.- Daudnagar, District- Aurangabad (Bihar)

.....Accused Person

Versus

State Opposite Party

.....
On behalf of the petitioner: Sri Amit Kumar, learned Advocate

On behalf of the State: Sri Dhramraj Sharma, learned APP

ORDER DATED 08.06.2026

The instant Anticipatory bail Petition has been filed on behalf of the above named petitioner/ accused who is apprehending his arrest in connection with the Jamhore P.S. Case No. 22/2019 under Section 341, 323, 384, 385, 504, 506 and Section 34 of the IPC.

The Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case only on the basis of his name in the copy of the agreement. The learned Counsel has further submitted that no other bail petition has been filed or pending in any Court or any higher Court. The learned Counsel has further submitted that the Cognizance has been taken under non-bailable Sections and the non-bailable warrant has been issued by the learned Court. The learned Counsel has further submitted that co-accused Anil Kumar is proprietor of Auto Safe Solution and SN Enterprises which was authorised for pasting stickers. The rent agreement of the shop is also in the name of the co-accused Anil Kumar and the petitioner has no concern with the same. The learned Counsel has further submitted that petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence and he has been falsely implicated by the police on the basis of suspicion. The learned Counsel has further submitted that the main accused Anil Kumar has been granted anticipatory bail by the High Court, Patna in Criminal Miscellaneous no. 24747/2019 dated 10.07.2019. The learned Counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent. Accordingly, the learned Counsel has prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

On the other hand, the learned A.P.P. for the State has submitted that petitioner was partner in a company which was involved in extorting money from vehicles in the name of pasting reflective stickers. The learned APP has further submitted that during

the course of investigation the petitioner/ accused was released on bond but thereafter the petitioner/accused never appeared before the Court and has, thus, violated the terms of bond. The learned APP has further submitted that despite of knowledge of the case the petitioner has not appeared before the Court and has not furnished any reason for the same. Accordingly, the learned APP has prayed that the anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner may be rejected.

Heard both the sides and perused the case record. On perusal of case record it is revealed that this case has been lodged under Section 341, 323, 384, 385, 504, 506 and Section 34 of the IPC. The prosecution story in brief as per the FIR is that on the alleged date of occurrence while the informant was plying his truck on NH-139, 3-4 un-known persons stopped his vehicle and forcibly tried to paste Reflective tape on his truck and demanded Rs. 500/- for the same from the informant. When the informant refused, the accused persons abused him and tried to assault him. Later on the reflective tapes were seized from the shop of co-accused. The seizure list is available on the record. During the course of investigation it was found that the petitioner/ accused was also a partner in the said shop. Further, from perusal of the case record it appears that in this case the cognizance for offence punishable under Section 341, 323, 384, 385, 504, 506 and Section 34 of the IPC was taken by the Court of learned CJM, Aurangabad vide order dated 08.08.2019 against the petitioner/ accused Dhananjay Kumar and co-accused Anil Kumar. From perusal of the case record it appears that since then about 7 years have lapsed but record is still pending for appearance of accused/petitioner. From materials available on record it appears that the petitioner/accused had knowledge of the case and it appears that the petitioner/accused has deliberately delayed the proceedings in this case.

Considering the above stated facts and circumstances and submissions made this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of the anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly the anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of the petitioner **Dhananjay Kumar is hereby rejected.**

Dictated by

I/C District & Additional Sessions Judge IV,
Aurangabad (Bihar)
08.06.2026

