

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

A.B.A.No. 328/2026

(Arising out of Sono (Charkapathar) P.S. Case No. 32/2014)

Jibu Yadav S/o Late Marubar Yadav aged about 56 years
R/o Village- Charaiya, P.S.- Charkapathar (Sono), Dist.- Jamui.

..... **Petitioner**
Vrs.

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

19.3.2026

1. This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Sono (Charkapathar) P.S. Case No. 32/2014, registered for the offence U/s. 341, 323, 307 and 504 of the I.P.C. pending in the court of Sri. Mrinal Aryan, J.M. 1st Class, Jamui.
2. Heard Sri. Ashok Kr. Sinha, the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned P.P. for the State.
3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Basudeo Yadav has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the Officer-in-Charge of Charkapathar Police Station, alleging therein that on 23.02.2014 at 4:00 p.m. when the informant was ploughing his field, then petitioner came there and asked to the informant that why he has put soil on the boundary of his field, and thereafter, started abusing the informant, and when the informant protested, then the petitioner struck on the head of the informant by means of Lathi with an intention to kill him, and consequently, the informant got injury and fell down from the earth and when the nearby people came there, he was saved and the instant case was registered.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the case is very old but the cognizance has been taken on dated 04.12.2023 under sections 341, 323, 307 and 504 of the I.P.C. against the petitioner and thereafter he has filed an anticipatory bail petition, which was withdrawn but the fact remains that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case and the nature of injury caused to the informant is simple in nature.
5. The learned P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that after the cognizance, the prayer of anticipatory bail was dismissed as withdrawn. Hence, this 2nd anticipatory bail

petition is not maintainable.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that the earlier prayer of anticipatory bail of the petitioner has already been dismissed as withdrawn by this court vide order dated 19.12.2024 passed in A.B.P. No. 1804/2024 and there is no any fresh ground in the present anticipatory bail petition. Moreover, the case is very old.

Hence, the prayer of petitioner once again rejected.

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.