

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

A.B.A.No.503/2026

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S.Case No.22/2026)

1. Nitish Kumar S/o Sibu Yadav aged about 32 years resident of village Karhara, P.S. Jhajha, District Jamui.

..... **Petitioner**

Vrs.

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

16.6.2026

1. This is an anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of above named petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Jhajha P.S.Case No.22/2026 registered for the offence U/s.190, 191(2), 326(g), and 329(3) of the B.N.S. pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui.

2. Heard Sri Satyajeet Kumar, the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned P.P. for the State.

3. The prosecution case as stated in the F.I.R. is that the informant Sanjana Kumari has lodged the instant case by submitting an application before the SHO of Jhajha Police station alleging therein that the accused Nitish Kumar had recorded the nude video of the informant and pressurized her to make illicit relationship with him. Accused Nitish Kumar also intimidated the informant that if she would not fulfill the demand, he will kill her husband. After that accused Nitish Kumar sexually exploited her. When the informant informed her family members about the act of the accused Nitish Kumar, then informant's family members told the family of the accused persons, on which, accused Nitish Kumar started abusing and assaulting the informant. Further all the F.I.R. named accused persons came at the house of the informant and they set fire to the informant's house damaging the valuables, cash and other important documents of the informant and her family members.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner has not filed any other bail petition either before this court or before the Hon'ble Court except the present one. The petitioner has clean antecedent. Moreover, similarly situated other co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail by the court of Sessions vide an order dated 20.2.2026 passed in ABA.No.111/2026, and the case of the petitioner more or less stands on similar footing.

5. The learned P.P.for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the petitioner is the kingpin of the entire occurrence, and there is serious allegation against him for recording video while the informant was taking bath and he further abused her physically after blackmailing her.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that the entire allegation is attributed against the petitioner who is main accused in this case, and further there is serious allegation against him that he made nude video of the informant while she was taking bath, and on the threatening of making it viral he physically abused the informant and further on protest, he put fire to the house of the informant alongwith other accused persons, therefore, the allegation against the petitioner is graver and more serious than that who have been granted anticipatory bail in this case.

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

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)

Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.