

In the Court of Sri Sandip Singh, Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui,

A.B.A.No.81/2026

(Arising out of Chandramandih P.S.Case No.139/2022)

1. Kongress Yadav S/o Late Dhanu Yadav aged about 33 years,
 2. Ranjit Yadav @ Shobhan Yadav S/o Roshan Yadav aged about 27 years,
 3. Tetu Yadav S/o Roshan Yadav aged about 47 years,
 4. Guliya Devi W/o Roshan Yadav aged about 60 years,
 5. Kinu Yadav @ Kinu Mahto S/o Maharaj @ Maharaj Mahto aged about 56 years, and
 6. Rashun Yadav S/o Late Prayag Mahato aged about 65 years,
- All resident of village Simratari, P.S. Chakai, District Jamui.

..... **Petitioners**

Vrs.

The State of Bihar..... O.P.

24.3.2026

1. This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Chandramandih P.S.Case No.139/2022 registered for the offence U/s. 341, 323, 307, 427, 379, 404, and 506 read with 34 of the I.P.C.pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui.
2. Heard Sri Parsidh Narayan Singh, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned P.P. for the State.
3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Dwarka Yadav has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Chandramandih Police Station alleging therein that on 1.8.2022, the F.I.R. named accused persons including the petitioners came at the house of the informant and forcefully damaged the fencing of the agricultural land of the informant and when informant protested, then it is further alleged that the accused Kongress Yadav struck on the head of the brother of the informant namely Naresh Yadav by means of Farsa who got injury on his head. It is further alleged that another accused Ranjit Yadav struck on the head of Kiran Kumari by means of sword, and Pankaj Kumar was assaulted by Karu Yadav with Axe and other accused persons have also assaulted to the informant and his family members and snatched wrist watch along with cash amount of Rs.500/- from the pocket of the informant, and the accused persons also looted the house-hold articles from the house of the informant and gave threatening for dire consequences if any case would be registered against them by the informant.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that earlier

the petitioner Nos.1,2,3, 5 and 6 have filed anticipatory bail application No.2374/2023 which was dismissed as withdrawn by this court vide an order dated 15.2.2024. But in the supplementary affidavit, it has been stated that no any bail application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner No.4 namely Guliya Devi and all the petitioners have clean antecedent. It is further submitted that he has filed this second anticipatory bail application on behalf of the petitioner Nos.1,2,3,5 and 6 on substantial change in the circumstances.

5. The learned P.P.for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and further submitted that the allegation against the petitioners are serious as there is allegation for assaulting to the informant side on their vital part of the body. Moreover, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioners except petitioner No. 4 Guliya Devi have already been dismissed as withdrawn and his successive anticipatory bail application is not maintainable because mere superficial change cannot satisfy to renew hearing of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that earlier the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner **Nos.1,2,3,5, and 6, namely Kongress Yadav, Ranjit Yadav @ Sobhan Yadav, Tetu Yadav, Kinu Yadav @ Kinu Mahto, and Rashun Yadav** have already been rejected and there is no any substantial change in the circumstances, and they have assaulted on the vital part of the body of the informant and his family members. Hence, the prayer for **anticipatory bail of petitioner Nos.1,2,3,5, and 6 namely Kongress Yadav, Ranjit Yadav @ Shobhan Yadav, Tetu Yadav, Kinu Yadav @ Kinu Mahto and Rashun Yadav are rejected.**

7. But so far as prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner No.4 namely Guliya Devi is concerned, it appears that petitioner No.4 Guliya Devi is happens to be a woman having clean antecedent and she has not filed any other anticipatory bail application earlier, and further there is no any specific overt act has been alleged against her.

Hence, in view of the aforesaid facts, let the **petitioner No.4 Guliya Devi** be released on anticipatory bail in the event of her arrest or surrender before the court below within four weeks from the date of the order on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below subject to the conditions as laid down

In the Court of Sri Sandip Singh, Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui,
ABA.No.81/2026 (Arising out of Chandramandih P.S.Case No.139/2022) Kongress Yadav & 5 others, Vrs.State of Bihar, Order dated 24.3.2026.

U/s.482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application is **disposed off.**

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.

COPY