

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
B.P. No. 1374/2026
Shankar Kumar & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar
Jehanabad Rail P.S. Case No. 03/2026

25.07.2026

Present :

For the petitioner --: Sri Mukesh Chandra Sinha, Ld. Advocate

For the State-----: Sri S. B. Ojha, Ld. Public Prosecutor

The present petition for regular bail has been filed on behalf of petitioners 1. Shankar Kumar 2. Sanjeet Kumar @ Baudha who are in judicial custody since 28.02.2026 in connection with Jehanabad Rail P.S. Case No. 03/2026 registered for the offence punishable under sections 305, 317(2), 112, 3(5) of the BNS.

The prosecution story as per the informant in brief is that on 27.02.2026 at about 01:40 p.m. the informant boarded the train from Makhdumpur along with his minor son. It is further alleged that as the train approached Jehanabad Court halt, the informant's son suddenly cried, upon which the informant noticed that his gold locket and silver chain worn around his neck had been cut and stolen by a boy standing nearby and the child pointed out at the said person and at that time, the train stopped at the said station and one boy jumped off and fled. It is further alleged that with the help of passengers, two suspicious boys were apprehended inside the train. On interrogation they disclosed their names as Shankar Kumar and Veeru Kumar and that they stated that Shankar Kumar had cut the gold locket and silver chain and handed them over to his associate Baudha who fled at Jehanabad court halt. The informant brought the accused persons to Taregana Railway Station, where railway police interrogated them and a search was made. It is further alleged that from Shankar Kumar Rs.42/- in cash was recovered and from Veeru Kumar, one silver locket which he had admitted was stolen from another passenger. Hence this FIR.

Ld. counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
B.P. No. 1374/2026
Shankar Kumar & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar
Jehanabad Rail P.S. Case No. 03/2026

are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case and that, they have committed no offence. He further contends that no stolen articles of the informant was recovered from the petitioner no. 1 only 42/- rupees which was his own money and the petitioner no. 2 was not caught on the spot and nothing was recovered from his physical possession and that, merely on the basis of suspicion, they have been implicated in this case.

Ld. counsel further contended that the petitioners no. 1 carries no criminal antecedents and the petitioner no. 2 carries three criminal antecedents and that, they have been in judicial custody since 28.02.2026 i.e. for more than four months, hence the prayer for bail of the petitioner may be considered favourably.

Ld. P.P. has also been heard in opposition to the prayer for bail.

I have considered the submissions as advanced by the parties and have perused the FIR and the contents thereof. The petitioner no. 1 carries no criminal antecedents and the petitioner no. 2 carries three criminal antecedents which has been referred to in Para-3 of the bail petition. Furthermore the petitioners have been in judicial custody since 28.02.2026 i.e. for more than four months.

In that view of the aforesaid, particularly taking note of the prolonged custody of the petitioners, the prayer for bail is hereby **allowed**. The petitioners are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of **Rs. 25,000/-** with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
(P. K. Malik)
Sessions Judge, Gayaji
25.07.2026