

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I, GAYA
ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION No. 1599/2026

- =====
1. Shankar Sao S/o Ranjendra Sao
 2. Meera Devi W/o Shankar Sao
 3. Sushila Devi W/o Rajendra Sao
 4. Rajendra Sao S/o Late Badri Sao
All R/o Village-Jeeyan Bigha, P.S.- Tankuppa,
District- Gaya

----- Petitioners

VERSUS

The State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

=====

24.07.2026

This anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of above named accused/petitioners, who are apprehending their arrest, in connection with **Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 56/2026**, for the offences registered **U/s. 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 109, 329(4), 74, 324(2), 352, 351(2), 303(2) of the B.N.S., pending in the Court of Ld. A.C.J.M.-IV, Gaya.**

2. Heard both the sides on the bail application.
3. Learned Defence Counsel submitted that prior to this, the petitioners have not filed any anticipatory bail petition before this Court or the Hon'ble Patna High Court. It is further submitted that petitioners are innocent, committed no offence and have falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the real fact is that the family members of the informant assaulted the accused Raushan Kumar and Meera Devi and also manhandled with her for that a case has been registered as Tankuppa P.S. Case No. 57/2026 against the informant and his family members. Lastly he submitted that petitioners having no criminal antecedent. Hence, it is prayed for grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the accused petitioners.
4. Per contra the Ld. A.P.P. appeared on behalf of State duly assisted by Ld. Counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

5. Prosecution case, in brief, as per informant is that on 18.03.2026 at about 9.30 A.M., all the accused petitioners along with other co-accused persons came at house of informant and while abusing him and manhandled his daughter-in-law and slammed her on the ground. It is further stated that accused persons also snatched golden chain and ear rings from her. It is further stated that when the son of informant came to save them, the accused Amit Kumar assaulted him with rod, due to which he sustained injury on his head. It is further stated that all the accused

persons misbehaved with the daughter of the informant and assaulted her. They also pelted stones on his shop and causing damage of articles in the shop and broken glass.

6. Heard both the parties and perused the material available on record. From perusal, it appears that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. The allegation against the petitioners is that they along with other co-accused persons abused and assaulted informant and her family members and caused them injuries, but there is no specific allegation of making assault against the petitioners. Injury report of injured Rishu Kumar, Nandani Kumari and Ashmita Kumari are available at para 52, 53 and 91 of the case diary which have been found simple in nature. On 06.06.2026 during hearing of the bail, Ld. Counsel for informant claimed that the injury of Rishu Kumar is available at para 52 of the case diary is wrong as injured Rishu Kumar was referred to ANMMCH, Gaya for C.T. Scan and he also filed copy of referred prescription and in this regard a report was called for from the Civil Surgeon, Gaya regarding genuineness of the injury report, though report is still awaiting but the updated case diary which has been produced by the Ld. A.P.P. and from perusal of para 107 of the same updated case diary, it transpires that revised injury of Rishu Kumar is available and opinion of doctor is reserved for want of CT Scan report and it has also been mentioned in last of the same para that ***“initially online injury report disposed and freezed due to communication gap as CT advised on next day i.e. on 19.03.2026 by other doctor and not mentioned in injury register.*** Vide para 19 of supplementary case diary, the injury report of injured Rishu Kumar has been found according to C.T. Scan report that the injury is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt substance. Petitioners claimed to have clean antecedent vide para 03 of their bail petition.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and other materials on record, this court thinks it fit to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, it is directed that in the event of their arrest or surrender before the Ld. Court below within a month from the date of this order, the petitioners shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each subject to the all conditions stipulated u/s. 482 of BNSS.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Shashi Kant Ojha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-1, Gaya
24.07.2026