

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, JAMUI  
B.A.NO.- 348/2026  
Kamal Kishor Singh Vs. State of Bihar

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, JAMUI

B.A.NO.- 348/2026

Arising out of Malaypur P.S Case No. 65/2026  
U/S- 126(2), 115(2), 329(4), 308(4), 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of B.N.S

Learned counsel for the Petitioner.....Sri Pradeep Mandal, Advocate  
Learned counsel for the State.....Sri Dhiraj Kumar Singh, A.P.P.

PRESENT-PRABHAT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA  
DISTRICT AND ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, JAMUI  
DATE OF ORDER- 5<sup>th</sup>, June 2026

ORDER

05-06-2025

Regular bail application dated 22-05-2026 filed on behalf of petitioner Kamal Kishor Singh @ Pintoo Singh S/o Late Sachidanand Singh R/o Village- Malaypur, P.S.- Malaypur, District- Jamui in connection with Malaypur P.S Case No. 65/2026, U/S- 126(2), 115(2), 329(4), 308(4), 352, 351(2), 351(3) and 3(5) of B.N.S, is put up before me for order today. Petitioner is in custody since 20-05-2026.

The prosecution case in brief as per F.I.R is that on 15-05-2026 at about 9:30 P.M, petitioner along with other accused persons and 10 unknown persons arrived at informant's house in a drunken state on motorcycle and in a car. All were armed with weapons. They entered into informant's house with intention to kill him, when the informant's uncle stepped out from his room, the accused persons began slapping him. When his uncle objected accused Mintu Kumar Singh @ Manish Kumar Singh and Bikku Kumar jointly caught him. Subsequently, Kamal Kishor Singh and Navneet Singh entered the room and drawn pistols from their waistbands, informant and his father Tuntun Kumar Singh were kept at gunpoint. The accused abused the informant and made a demand of Rs. 2,00,000/- as extortion money else they will kill him. Accused Kamal Kishor Singh has several cases of kidnapping against him. When informant's aunt Rupa Devi came to save him accused Navneet Singh dashed him on earth. The informant called at 112 and the police came and inquired the occurrence. The accused persons fled away threatening the informant and others. The matter/occurrence is stored/captured in C.C.T.V footage.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that he is quite innocent and has committed no offence and he has falsely been implicated in this case with an ulterior motive. He further submitted that no bail application either anticipatory or regular on behalf of the petitioner has been filed or rejected either by the Sessions Court or by the Hon'ble High Court Patna earlier. He further submitted that there is delay of three days in lodging F.I.R. No offence U/s- 308(4) and 351(3) of B.N.S is made out against the petitioner and other offences are bailable in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 20-05-2026. There is dispute between the parties relating to passage so, with a view to make pressure this case has been lodged. There is no criminal antecedent against the petitioner except one inquiry wherein the cognizance has not been taken as yet. The allegation against the petitioner is false and he was not arrested at the P.O, thus it is submitted that he may be allowed 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. Ld. counsel for the infor-

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, JAMUI**

**B.A.NO.- 348/2026**

**Kamal Kishor Singh**

**Vs.**

**State of Bihar**

mant submits that the petitioner is criminal minded person. He has filed a cassette and a pen-drive.

The cassette and pen-drive was not given to I.O rather the case-diary shows that the informant had told to police that it will be provided to police whenever technician comes. The cassette and pen-drive filed in the court do not bear the certificate as prescribed U/s- 65 of Indian Evidence Act.

Heard the submission made by both the parties. On perusal of case record it transpires that there is allegation against the petitioner that he along with others entered into house of informant in drunken condition and threatened the informant and his father on the point of pistol and made a demand of Rs. 2,00,000/- as extortion money. The petitioner is in custody since 20-05-2026. There is dispute between the parties relating to passage. Civil dispute between the parties is admitted fact. The informant has himself through application given to I.O, stated in Para-17 that Pankaj Kumar Singh and Rupa Devi did not get any treatment from any private or government institution. So, in the light of facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the fact that there is civil dispute between the parties and the petitioner is in custody since 20-05-2026, I am of the view to allow bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing a bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of Ld. trial court. The petitioner is directed to file an undertaking before Ld. trial court that he will not involve himself in any type of case. If, he is found involved so, Ld. trial court may initiate proceeding for cancellation of bail bond. One of the bailor will be family member/close relative of the petitioner. The petitioner will remain physically present before court when ordered so and he will co-operate in investigation and trial.

**Dictated**

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

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Date of judgment/order           | 05 <sup>th</sup> , June 2026 |
| Date of reserving judgment/order | Nil (same date)              |
| Uploading date                   | 05 <sup>th</sup> , June 2026 |
| Uploaded by                      | Shraddha Sharma              |