

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

A.B.A.No.278/2026

(Arising out of Malaypur P.S.Case No.18/2026)

1. Jagdish Yadav S/o Late Sukar Yadav aged about 75 years,
 2. Gautam Yadav @ Pandey @ Gautam Kumar Yadav S/o Jagdish Yadav aged about 29 years,
 3. Dulo Devi @ Dulla Devi W/o Jagdish Yadav aged about 56 years, and
 4. Sumitra Devi W/o Gautam Yadav alias Gautam Kumar Yadav aged about 28 years
- All resident of village Pamaia (Katauna) P.S. Malaypur, District Jamui.

Petitioners

Vrs.

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

29.4.2026

1. This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Malaypur P.S.Case No.18/2026 registered for the offence U/s.191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 74, 108, 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 303(2) of the B.N.S.pending in the court of the C.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 the informant Sanju Devi has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Malaypur Police Station alleging therein that on 9.2.2026 while the informant was cutting the grass in front of her house, then all the petitioners having variously armed with came there and accused Gautam Yadav @ Pandey assaulted her and when the informant raised alarm, then her husband came in her rescue, then Gautam Yadav @ Pandey struck on the head of the husband of the informant with an intention to kill him who consequently got injury over there. It is lastly alleged that Sumitra Devi snatched gold chain of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. There is no specific allegation against the petitioners except one Gautam Yadav, but no any injury report is available in the case diary. All the petitioners have clean antecedent. There is case and counter case between the parties regarding the occurrence.

5. The learned P.P.for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the injury report has not been submitted by the I.O.of this case and a letter has been received from the concerned police

station stating therein that the I.O. of this case is on leave, therefore, the injury report could not be submitted.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner except one Gautam Yadav who struck on head of the husband of the informant, but there is no injury report is available with the case diary.

Hence, in view of the aforesaid facts, let the petitioners be released on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within four weeks from the date of the order on furnishing bail bonds 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 U/s.482(2) of the B.N.S.S. **with further conditions that one of the bailors of the petitioners must be their close relative, and petitioners shall remain present before the court below on each and every date, failing to appear on two consecutive dates without any cogent reason shall result in cancellation of their bail bonds.**

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.