

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

**B.A.No.80/2026**

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S. Case No.462/2025)

1. Mitu Yadav S/o Rameshwar Yadav aged about 35 years resident of village Dahiwara,  
Post Pindra, P.S. Chandan Katoria, District Banka

.....**Petitioner**

**Vrs.**

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

( with )

**B.A.No.102/2026**

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S. Case No.462/2025)

1. Vijay Kumar /o Shivshankar Yadav aged about 35 years resident of village Dighibara,  
P.S. Anandpur Bhairganj, District Banka

.....**Petitioner**

**Vrs.**

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

13.3.2026

1. One regular bail application No.80/2026 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner Mitu Yadav, who is in custody since 28.9.2025, and one another regular bail application No.102/2026 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner Vijay Kumar who is in custody since 28.9.2025. These two applications arises out of the same case i.e. Jhajha P.S. Case No.462/2025 U/s.140(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S. pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui. Hence, both are taken up together for hearing and disposal by a common orders.

2. Heard Sri Ashok Prasad Keshri, and Sri Murlidhar Pandey, the learned counsels for the petitioners and the learned P.P. for the State.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the instant case has been registered on the basis of the fard beyan of the informant Sunita Devi alleging therein that on 24.9.2025 her husband namely Santosh Singh went to Belhar Sangrampur market by his motorcycle with his mobile but he did not returned to his home. Thereafter, on next day a call was made on the mobile of his tractor's driver by her husband informing that he has been abducted and he further requested for arrangement of Rs.two lakhs as ransom. Thereafter, the informant informed to the police concerned and thereafter, the Dy.S.P. of Belhar P.S. went to Manihari forest alongwith the informant, where, the motorcycle of the victim was found. Thereafter, on next very day, a call was again made demanding ransom of Rs.two lakhs by the culprits and they also threatened for dire

consequences if the information would be given to the police.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The name of both the petitioners surfaced in the case on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused and they have also confessed their guilt during investigation which has no any evidenciary value in the eye of law. The petitioners have neither demanded any ransom nor it was delivered.

5. The learned P.P.has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submitted that the petitioners have two criminal antecedents. The petitioners have been arrested by the police during investigation and they have confessed their guilt. The victim has also identified both of them in the Test Identification Parade which is mentioned in para 70 of the case diary. Moreover, prayer of bail of one co-accused Dinesh Yadav has already been rejected by this court vide an order dated 29.1.2026 passed in B.A.No.07/2026.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that there is serious allegation against the petitioner and they have criminal antecedents. Moreover,both the petitioners have been identified by the victim in the Test Identification Parade.

Hence, in view of the aforesaid facts, this court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail, and accordingly, their prayer for bail is **rejected**.

( Dictated )

( Sandip Singh )

**Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.**