

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

A.B.A.No.337/2026

(Arising out of Khaira P.S. Case No.51/2026)

1. Kabita Devi @ Kabita Kumari W/o Pramod Yadav @ Pramod Kumar aged about 27 years,
2. Sunita Devi @ Lalita Devi W/o Guddu Yadav @ Gudadi Yadav aged about 43 years,
3. Tinku Devi @ Pinku Devi W/o Doman Yadav aged about 32 years,

All resident of village Nimnawada, P.S. Khaira, District Jamui.

Petitioners.

Vrs.

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

(with)

A.B.A.No.371/2026

(Arising out of Khaira P.S. Case No.51/2026)

1. Pramod Yadav S/o Late Nuneshwar Yadav aged about 33 years,
 2. Doman Yadav S/o Late Nuneshwar Yadav aged about 35 years,
- Both resident of village Nimnawada, P.S. Khaira, District Jamui.

Petitioners.

Vrs.

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

- 20.4.2026
1. One anticipatory bail application No.337/2026 has been filed on behalf of the accused/petitioners namely 1) Kabita Devi @ Kabita Kumari, 2) Sunita Devi @ Lalita Devi, and 3) Tinku Devi @ Pinku Devi and another anticipatory bail application No.371/2026 has been filed on behalf of the accused/petitioners 1) Pramod Yadav and 2) Doman Yadav. These two applications arises out of the same case i.e. Khaira P.S.Case No.51/2026 registered U/s. 126(2), 115(2),117(2), 118(1), 109(1), 303(2), 351(2) and 352 read with 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 Makeshwar Prasad Yadav, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned P.P. for the State assisted by Sri Shyamdeo Singh, the learned counsel for the informant.
 3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Nirmal Yadav

has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Khaira P.S. alleging therein that on 10.2.2026 some altercation was happened between the informant and some of the accused persons regarding watering of the field of the accused persons and on the same day when the family members of the informant were returning to their house from the field, then in the mid way, accused Guddu Yadav having lashed with sword, Doman Yadav having lashed with iron rod and Pramod Yadav having lashed with sharp cutting weapon surrounded them and it is specifically alleged against Guddu Yadav that he struck on the head of the son of the informant namely Sanjay Yadav by sword and when he fell down, then another accused Doman Yadav hit him by iron rod. When the informant tried to save his son, then Doman Yadav assaulted him by iron rod, but in course of saving himself, his hand was got fractured. But he was again assaulted by Doman Yadav on his ear-pit by iron rod. It is further alleged that when the wife of the informant namely Sushila Devi came in rescue of the informant, then Pramod Yadav struck on her head by iron weapon and she became fainted. The another son of the informant namely Kedar Yadav was also assaulted by Doman Yadav by iron rod. The daughter-in-law of the informant Sunita Devi was assaulted by the petitioners Kabita Devi, Tinku Devi and Lalita Devi by legs and further Kabita Devi was also assaulted her by throwing stone which hit on the side of her ear-pit, and the gold ear ring was snatched by Tinku Devi.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners namely 1) Kabita Devi, 2) Sunita Devi, and 3) Tinku Devi (vide ABA.No.337/2026) have clean antecedent, but petitioner Pramod Yadav and Doman Yadav (vide ABA. No.371/2026) have criminal antecedents as the petitioner Pramod Yadav has one criminal antecedent, whereas, petitioner No.2 Doman Yadav has two criminal antecedents. The injury of Sunita Devi and Sushila Devi are simple in nature, whereas, some persons from informant side have also got grievous injuries in the occurrence. There is case and counter case between the parties and from the accused side, a complaint case was filed, wherein, it is alleged that on the day of occurrence a dacoity was committed in the house of complainant by the family members of the informant.

5. The learned P.P. for the State assisted by the learned lawyer for the

informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submitted that from perusal of injury reports, it is evident that altogether five persons including the informant are injured in this case and some of the injuries are grievous in nature and also corroborating the allegation against the petitioners. Moreover, it is a case of attempt of murder with prior meeting of mind.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and further considering the particular fact that total five persons from the informant side are injured in this case, and out of them, two persons namely Nirmal Yadav (informant) and Sanjay Yadav have received grievous injury which corroborates the allegation alleged in the F.I.R.

Hence, in view of the aforesaid facts, this court feels that it is not a fit case for granting the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, and accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is **rejected**.

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.