

Page No.1  
Court of Sessions Judge, Darbhanga.  
Present :- Shri Neeraj Kumar-II, I/c Sessions Judge, Darbhanga  
B.P. 526/2026 ( Sonu Sharma Vs. State of Bihar)

**In the Court of Sessions Judge, Darbhanga, Bihar.**  
**B.P. No.526/2026**

**In the matter of :-**

1.Sonu Sharma son of Radhey Shyam Sharma----- **Petitioner.**

**Vrs.**

The State of Bihar ----- **Opposite Party.**

**Learned counsel for the petitioner : Shri Uday Lal Deo, Advocate.**

**Learned counsel for Opp.Party : Shri Amrendra Nr. Jha, P.P.**

=====

**ORDER**

**25.06.2026.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned P.P. for the state on the bail petition filed on behalf of above named accused/petitioner, who is in custody since 16.05.2026 in connection with Jalley P.S. Case No. 99/2026 for offence U/ss 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 352 and 351(2) of the BNS.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with other accused persons assaulted the informant with axe and iron rod. When her sons Raja Kumar and Deepak Kumar and nephew Rupesh Sharma intervened, the petitioner and other accused persons assaulted them and injured them.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has committed no offence as alleged in the F.I.R. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case due to grudge, enmity as well a village politics. As a matter of fact, family members of the informant tried to grab the land of accused Radhey Shyam Sharma and when he protested, the family members of informant abused, assaulted him for which Jalley PS Case No. 100/2026 has been lodged against the informant and others and this case has been filed only to save their skin. It is further submitted that no

**Page No.2**  
**Court of Sessions Judge, Darbhanga.**  
**Present :- Shri Neeraj Kumar-II, I/c Sessions Judge, Darbhanga**  
**B.P. 526/2026 ( Sonu Sharma Vs. State of Bihar)**

case under section 109(1) of BNS is made out against the petitioner. The accused petitioner is in jail custody since 16.05.2026 having clean antecedent. It is therefore prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for bail.

5. Heard both sides and perused the case record. Evidently the dispute erupted over some land dispute. The injury report of injured persons show the injury to be simple in nature. There is general and omnibus allegation against petitioner. The accused petitioner has clean antecedent. The accused petitioner has been in judicial custody since 16.05.2026.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case discussed above, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby **allowed** on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned with condition that the accused petitioner will not get himself involved in the offence of similar nature and in case of default, prosecution shall be at liberty to initiate cancellation of bail of accused petitioner.

7. It is made clear that this order has no bearing on the merits of the case.

(Dictated)

(Neeraj Kumar-II)  
I/c Sessions Judge  
Darbhanga.  
25.06.2026.