

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, JAMUI

Regular Bail No.- 226/2026

Gopal YadavPetitioner

Vs.

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

Arising out of Batiya P.S Case No. 79/2025

U/S- 137(2), 103(1), 61(2),3(5) of B.N.S and 25(1-B)a, 26, 27, 35 Arms Act.

Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner.....Sri Murlidhar Pandey, Ld.Advocate

Ld. Counsel for the State.....Md. Tahir Ansari, A.P.P.

Present-Prabhat Kumar Srivastava
Distt. & Addl. Sessions Judge- IV, Jamui
Date of Order- 29 April 2026

ORDER

29.04.2026

Regular bail application dated 06.04.2026 filed on behalf of petitioner **Gopal Yadav S/o- Rohan Yadav**, R/o Village- Rajasare, P.S- Mohanpur, Distt- Deoghar (Jharkhand) in connection with Batiya P.S Case No. 79/2025, U/S- 137(2), 103(1), 61(2),3(5) of B.N.S and 25(1-B)a, 26, 27, 35 Arms Act is put up before me for order today. Petitioner is under judicial custody since 23.03.2026.

The prosecution case in brief as per F.I.R is that on dated 11.12.2025 husband of informant went to Jhumraj Baba for worship. She called her husband through telephone last time at about 11:25 hours, then her husband Vinod Mandal said that that he is with Gopal Yadav. Thereafter, neither Vinod Mandal nor Gopal Yadav getting call. Furthermore, Arun Kisku talk on the last call with Vinod Mandal.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had earlier filed A.B.A No- 30/2026 in the Ld. Court of D.A.S.J-IV, Jamui which was withdrawn on 04.02.2026 due to his surrender in Mohanpur P.S. Case No- 302/2025 on dated 27.01.2026 in the Court of S.D.J.M, Deoghar. The petitioner is an accused in Mohanpur P.S. Case No- 181/2025, GR No- 1094/2025. The petitioner has not been served with any notice U/s- 35(3) of BNSS. The petitioner is quite innocent and has not committed the aforesaid occurrence. The petitioner is under judicial custody since 23.03.2026 and there is no direct and specific allegation against him. Only on the basis of suspicion, he has been arrested in this case. The informant has not stated that she saw her husband going

with petitioner. There is no evidence to show that the deceased went to Jhumraj Baba with petitioner. It is therefore prayed to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail.

On the other hand learned A.P.P. opposed the bail application and submitted that the petitioner has committed serious offence so he does not deserve bail.

Heard the submission made by both the parties. On perusal of case record, it transpires that there is allegation that on last call to his wife the deceased told that he is with petitioner Gopal Yadav. During investigation the re-statement of informant and statement of other witnesses have been recorded wherein they have also supported the version of prosecution in para 02, 03, 04, 05, of the case diary and other relevant Paras of the case diary. Name of the petitioner arrayed in this case on the basis of tower location of present petitioner. Para 100 of the case diary shows that the petitioner has several criminal antecedents relating to serious nature.

On perusal of entire case diary, it reflects that there is sufficient material available on record petitioner. The matter against this petitioner is still pending for investigation since 2025 which shows that this petitioner did not co-operate in the investigation and kept the investigation pending till more than four months till now. So having considered nature of allegation, its impact upon society, and the conduct of the petitioner during investigation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on Regular bail. Accordingly, The prayer for Regular bail of petitioner **Gopal Yadav** is hereby **Rejected**.

**District & Addl. Sessions Judge-IV,
Jamui**