

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

A.B.A.No.401/2026

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S.Case No.589/2025)

1. Niranjan Mandal @ Niranjan Kumar S/o Dukhi Mandal aged about 28 years,
 2. Shivshankar Kumar @ Tubhan S/o Hari Kishore Gandharv aged about 26 years,
 3. Rajeev Mandal @ Rajeev Kumar S/o Janardhan Mandal aged about 27 years,
 4. Anivesh Kumar @ Abhishek Kumar S/o Ashok Mandal aged about 19 years,
- All four petitioners are resident of village Budhikhar, P.S. Jhajha, District Jamui,
5. Sharvesh Kumar @ Sharvesh Gandharv S/o Indradeo Gandharv @ Sukhdeo Gandharv resident of village Shayam Bazar, P.S. Bausi, District Patna.

..... **Petitioners**

Vrs.

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

18.4.2026

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.589/2025 registered for the offence U/s.190, 191(2), 115(2), 117(2), 118(2), 109, and 303(2) of the B.N.S.pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui.
2. Heard Sri Parsuram Yadav, the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned P.P.for the State.
3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Kundan Kumar has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Jhajha Police Station alleging therein that on 13.12.2025 he alongwith his co-villager Vivek Mandal proceeded for his house after closing his Grahak Seva Kendra, but in the mid way, six accused persons including the petitioner having lashed with pistol and iron rod intercepted them and accused Niranjan Mandal pointed the pistol on the ear-pit of the informant, and another accused Rohit Sah pointed the pistol on Vivek Mandal and they threatened to hand over the cash collected through Grahak Seva Kendra and when the informant and his friend protested, then all the accused persons assaulted to the informant, and further they took out Rs.70,000/- from the informant alongwith gold chain worth Rs.80,000/- and a golden wring of Rs.15,000/-. Thereafter, on alarm being made by the informant and his friend near by people proceeded towards the place of the occurrence, then the accused persons fled away from there.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The injury caused to

the informant is simple which is mentioned in paragraph 44 of the case diary and there was no intention to commit the murder to the informant and his friend by the accused persons and all the alleged offences are ornamental in nature.

5. The learned P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submitted that the petitioners have three criminal antecedents

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the nature of allegation and that the accused persons have taken the valuables and cash from the informant by putting him fear of death and they all have several criminal antecedents.

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.