

In the Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge-I, Darbhanga, Bihar.
BP No.- 188 of 2026

Ref :- Arising out of Laheriasarai PS Case No.-245/2025, Dated-12.04.2025,
U/s- 103(1), 3(5) BNS

In the matter of :-

Pankaj Kumar, Aged about 19 years, S/o Mahendra Yadav, R/o Village-Dhauashi, P.S.- Phulparash, District- Madhubani

----- **Petitioner**

Versus.

The State of Bihar

----- **Opposite Party**

Learned counsel for the petitioner : Sri Mukesh Kumar, Advocate.

Learned counsel for Opp.Party : Sri Amrendra Narayan Jha, P.P.

Date of order:- 17.03.2026

ORDER

1. The petitioner is praying for regular bail in connection with Laheriasarai PS Case No.-245/2025, Dated-12.04.2025, U/s- 103(1), 3(5) BNS is pending in the court of Ld CJM, Darbhanga. The petitioner is in judicial custody since 11.01.2026.
2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that the deceased, namely Amarjeet Kumar (a Child in Conflict with Law), had been lodged in the Observation Home, Darbhanga since 28.03.2025. On 10.04.2025 at about 11:00 PM, he complained of stomach pain and was immediately taken to DMCH, and was advised to return on 11.04.2025 for ultrasound examination. On 11.04.2025, while being brought back from DMCH, the deceased allegedly jumped out of the vehicle in an attempt to escape but was apprehended by the guards and brought back to the Observation Home. Subsequently, at about 6:30 PM, he was reported to have fallen unconscious by other inmates. He was again taken to DMCH, where he was declared dead. During investigation, it transpired that the present petitioner, along with seven other accused persons, had allegedly assaulted the deceased, resulting in injuries that led to his death.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated. It is further submitted that although three other criminal cases are pending against the petitioner, no specific overt act has been attributed to him in the present case. It is

also contended that the deceased was assaulted by local persons when he attempted to escape from custody, and not by the petitioner. It is further noted that the petitioner's earlier application for anticipatory bail was rejected by this Court vide ABP No. 1169 of 2025 dated 16.10.2025. On these grounds, prayer for bail has been made.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer for bail.
5. From perusal of the case diary, it appears that injuries indicative of violence have been recorded in the inquest report (as noted in paragraph 2 of the case diary). Further, the witnesses have supported the prosecution case. It is also alleged that prior to the occurrence, the accused persons had tampered with the CCTV system by cutting its wires, as mentioned in paragraph 5 of the case diary.
6. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the materials available on record, and the manner in which the offence is alleged to have been committed, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.
7. Accordingly, the bail application stands **rejected**.

(Dictated)

**District & Addl Sessions Judge-I
Darbhanga.
17.03.2026**

Date of Order	17-03-2026
Date of Reserving Order	17-03-2026
Uploading Date	19-03-2026
Uploaded by	Ratnesh Kumar (DEO)