

IN THE COURT OF AMIT KUMAR, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE V, JAMUI

----- (A.B.A. No. 534/2026) -----

Arising out of Charkapathar P.S. Case No. 39/ 2026, District-Jamui

Sandeep Vishwakarma Vs. State of Bihar

For Petitioner : Ld. Counsel Sri Pradeep Kumar Singh.

For The State : Ld. Addl. P. P. Sri. Sanjeev Kumar Singh.

Date of order : 21.05.2026

1. The present anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of the accused petitioner namely **Sandeep Vishwakarma, S/o Basudeo Mistree, aged about 39 years, resident of village- Bichachhagarh, P.S.- Charkapathar, District- Jamui** who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Charkapathar P.S. Case No. 39/ 2026 registered under sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 76, 324(4), 329(5), 308(5), 308(2), 303(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S.

2. The prosecution case in brief is that informant Sukar Vishwakarma aged about 70 years alleges that he together with his family members after constructing house has been living at his *Kami Sikmi* land for last ten years. Besides him, his gotiya namely Baijnath Vishwakarma, Jamuna Mistri and Dilip Vishwakarma was also residing there and running their respective shops in the same premises. On dated 16.03.2026 at about 02:30 pm, accused persons namely 1. Munna Barnwal, 2. Dhiraj Barnwal, 3. Niraj Barnwal, 4. Kailu Yadav, 5. Umesh Yadav, 6. Ghutar Yadav, 7. Jaddu Thakur, 8. Bipin Thakur, 9. Dilip Vishwakarma, 10. Sandeep Vishwakarma and 11. Prem Vishwakarma, all having armed with weapon came to his house and started abusing. Meanwhile accused Munna Barnwal, Dhiraj Barnwal and Kailu Yadav threatened that if they want to live on the said land they would have to pay ransom of rupees ten lakhs otherwise they would not let them live there. On being objected by the informant and his family members, the accused persons called JCB and get started bulldozing house-cum-shop while the informant and his family members still were inside it. Somehow the informant and his family members rescued themselves. The accused persons bulldozed all the house, shops and thrashed utensils, boxes and looted away valuable jewelry and articles. The accused persons also tried to outrage modesty of informant's daughter-in-law. Meanwhile accused 12. Kalam Ansari, the owner of JCB instructed to bulldoze everything. The informant further states that the video of the occurrence is also available with him. On the basis of above, FIR was registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence and falsely been implicated in this case. No other bail application is pending against the petitioner in any court except the present one. The petitioners has no criminal antecedent. From perusal of FIR itself, it appears that there is bonafide land dispute in between the parties and due to pressure politics this case has been lodged. All the sections are not

IN THE COURT OF AMIT KUMAR, ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE V, JAMUI

----- (A.B.A. No. 534/2026) -----

Arising out of Charkapathar P.S. Case No. 39/ 2026, District-Jamui

Sandeep Vishwakarma Vs. State of Bihar

applicable against the petitioner. As a matter of fact petitioner's mother has purchased the land of Khata No. 50 Plot No. 257 area 12.5 decimals from Noni Devi and Yugal Yadav and she is in peaceful possession over the same and the rent is being granted in her name. That Parwati Devi also purchased the land of same plot from Sageer Miya and since the date of purchase she is in possession. Although Parwati Devi has lodged complaint case 381C/2026 against the informant and others. Hence, it has been prayed to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, learned Addl. P.P. vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

5. Heard both the parties in detail and perused the record.

6. The FIR has been registered for the offence punishable under sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 76, 324(4), 329(5), 308(5), 308(2), 303(2), 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S. Re-statement of the informant is recorded vide para no. 2 and statement of witnesses has been recorded vide para no. 9 and statement of witness has been recorded vide para no. 9, 10, 11 and 13 of the Case diary.

7. Perusal of record reflects that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is allegation against him that he together with other co-accused persons came at the house-cum-shop of the informant and his accomplice demanded rupees ten lakhs as ransom otherwise they would not let them live there. On being objected by the informant and his family members the petitioner together with his accomplice called JCB and get started bulldozing the house-cum-shop of the informant. The bulldozing JCB has also been seized by the police. Further, there is allegation of outraging the modesty of informant's daughter-in-law. The witnesses at para no. 9, 10, 11 and 13 have also supported the allegation. Investigation in this case is still continued.

8. Considering aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case coupled with seriousness of allegation, this court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the accused petitioner. Hence, the anticipatory bail application of accused petitioner namely **Sandeep Vishwakarma, is hereby dismissed.**

9. Office is directed to send the trial court record, if any, to the court concerned along with the copy of this order.

Dictated

Sd/-

Addl. Sessions Judge - V, Jamui

Copy forwarded to the court concerned

Addl. Sessions Judge - V, Jamui