

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

A.B.A.No.356/2026

(Arising out of Jamui P.S. Case No.54/2026)

1. Karan Kumar @ Karan Sao S/o Surendra Prasad Sao aged about 26 years resident of village Nimarang, Ward No.30, P.O.+ P.S. Jamui, District Jamui.....**Petitioners.**

Vrs.

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

(with)

A.B.A.No.408/2026

(Arising out of Jamui P.S. Case No.54/2026)

1. Niraj Kumar @ Niraj Barnwal S/o Mahesh Prasad Modi aged about 23 years resident of village Bodhwan Talab, P.O.+ P.S. Jamui, District Jamui.

.....**Petitioner**

Vrs.

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

(with)

A.B.A.No.481/2026

(Arising out of Jamui P.S. Case No.54/2026)

1. Nitish Raj @ Nikky Yadav S/o Ramashish Yadav aged about 19 years resident of village Nimarang Mohalla Jayshankar Nagar, P.S. and District Jamui,
2. Bittu Kumar @ Bittu Yadav S/o Vijay Shankar Yadav aged about 19 years resident of village Tenghara, P.S. Barhat, District Jamui,
3. Radhey Yadav S/o Late Shibu Yadav aged about 34 years resident of village- Mohalla Eklabya college Road Patel Nagar Jamui, P.S. Jamui, District Jamui
4. Bhola Kumar Yadav @ Bhola Yadav S/o Jitendra Yadav aged about 23 years resident of village Nimarang, P.S. and District Jamui.

.....**Petitioners.**

Vrs.

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

07.5.2026

1. **One anticipatory bail application No.356/2026** has been filed on behalf of the **petitioner Karan Kumar @ Karan Sao**, 2nd **anticipatory**

bail application No.408/2026 has been filed on behalf of the **petitioner Niraj Kumar @ Niraj Barnwal**, and 3rd **anticipatory bail application No.481/2026** has been filed on behalf of the **petitioners namely 1) Nitish Raj @ Nikky Yadav, 2) Bittu Kumar @ Bittu Yadav, 3) Radhy Yadav, and 4) Bhola Kumar Yadav @ Bhola Yadav**. These three applications arises out of the same case i.e. **Jamui P.S.Case No.54/2026 registered U/s. 191(2), 191(3), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 109, 308(4), 333, 352 and 351 read with 3(5) of the B.N.S.** pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui. Hence, they are taken up together for hearing and disposal by a common orders.

2. Heard Sri Rajesh Kumar and Sri Makeshwar Prasad Yadav ,the learned counsels for the petitioners and the learned P.P.for the State.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Vipin @ Santosh Kumar has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Jamui Police Station alleging therein that on 6.2.2026 at about 8.30 p.m. all the total twelve F.I.R. named accused persons including the petitioner alongwith 10-15 unknown person having lashed with lathi and danda in their hands entered into Navrang Sweet shop of the informant and started to abuse and assault to the informant. When the informant and his brother protested, then all the accused persons started to assault to the brother of the informant namely Kundan Kumar resulting in head injury. When one Sunil Ram came to save him, then he was also assaulted by the accused persons, consequently his rib was fractured. It is lastly alleged that all the accused persons demanded Rs. Twenty Five lakhs as extortion money and threatened for dire consequences if the said money would not be paid and they lastly took out Rs.one lakh from the cash counter of the shop of the informant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners have jointly submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against all the petitioners for assaulting and demanding extortion money from the informant. Other co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by this court vide an order dated 2.4.2026 and 30.4.2026 passed in B.A.Nos.145/2026 and 248/2026, and allegation against the petitioners are almost similar in nature. Petitioner Karan Kumar @ Karan Sao (vide ABA. No.356/2026) has one criminal antecedent, petitioner No.1 (vide ABA.No. 481/2026) has two criminal antecedent, petitioner No.3) (vide ABA.No.481/

2026 has one criminal case, and petitioner No.4 (vide ABA.No.481/2026) has three criminal antecedent, whereas, other petitioners have clean antecedent.

5. The learned P.P.has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submitted that there is serious allegation against all the petitioners for demanding extortion money and it is specifically alleged against them that they have taken Rs.one lakh from the shop of the informant other co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by this court, hence, the case of these petitioners do not stand on similar footing with other co-accused persons who have been granted regular bail by this court.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that there is serious allegation against all the petitioners for assaulting to the informant and his family members, consequently, his brother and one Sunil Ram got injured in this case, and it further alleged against them that they have demanded Rangdari of Rs.twenty five lakhs and further took Rs.one lakh forcefully from the shop of the informant. The other co-accused persons have been granted regular bail by this court, therefore,the case of these petitioners is not similar with other co-accused persons who have been granted regular bail by this court.

Hence, in view of the serious allegation of demanding extortion money and forcefully taking Rs. one lakh from the shop of the informant, 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**.

It is however observed that if so advised, the petitioners may surrender before the court below and seek regular bail, and in that event, the learned court below shall consider the regular bail of the petitioners in accordance with law without being prejudiced by the aforesaid order.

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.