

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

**A.B.A.No.250/2026**

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S.Case No.219/2017)

1. Tukan Yadav S/o Late Janki Yadav aged about 63 years,
2. Subhash Yadav S/o Tukan Yadav aged about 31 years,
3. Vikash Yadav S/o Tukan Yadav aged about 38 years, and
4. Jeera Devi W/o Tukan Yadav aged about 49 years,  
All resident of village Karhara, P.S. Jhajha, District Jamui.

..... **Petitioners**

Vrs.

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

23.3.2026

1. This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Jhajha P.S.Case No.219/2017 registered for the offence U/s. 323, 341, 307, 504 and 380 read with 34 of the I.P.C. pending in the court of the S.D.J.M., Jamui.

2. Heard Sri C.Tanti, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned P.P. for the State.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that on the basis of complaint petition filed by the informant Lalu Yadav before the court of C.J.M. Jamui, in which, it has been alleged that on 20.7.2013 at 7 a.m, the informant was irrigating his field through river with the help of Diesel pump, but after some time, when he returned back after taking meal, then he found that section pipe was missing. In the torch light, the informant had seen the accused persons namely Tukan Yadav, Vikash Yadav and Subhash Yadav were fleeing after taking away the said pipe and informant chased them, then they threatened the informant. Therefore, in the morning, when his wife went to the house of the accused persons for making complain about the theft of pipe, then Tukan Yadav struck on the head of the wife of the informant by iron rod, consequently, she got head injury, and thereafter, other accused persons also assaulted the wife of the informant by fists and slaps and lathi. The accused person also assaulted the informant and his children when they went to save the informant's wife.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that though the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners have been rejected several times, but they have filed the present anticipatory bail petition on the basis of compromise between the parties.

5. The learned P.P.for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the alleged offence is not compoundable, and earlier the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners have already been refused by this court three times. Hence, it is not maintainable.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners have already been refused by this court earlier, and the alleged offence is not compoundable.

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

( Dictated )

( Sandip Singh )

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

COPY