

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

A.B.A.No.590/2026

(Arising out of Jhajha P.S.Case No.87/2026)

1. Santosh Kumar S/o Bodhan Yadav aged about 32 years resident of village Foksha, P.S. Jhajha, District Jamui.

..... **Petitioner**
Vrs.

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

22.6.2026

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.87/2026 registered for the offence U/s. 115(2), 126(2), 351(2) 352 and 109 of the B.N.S.pending in the court of the C.J.M., Jamui.

2. Heard Sri Sitaram Singh, the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned P.P. for the State.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Sinku Devi has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Jhajha Police Station alleging therein that on 28.2.2026 at 11 p.m. her co-villager Santosh Yadav (petitioner) barged in the house of the informant and outraged her modesty and also assaulted her, and when the informant made alarm, then her husband Pankaj Yadav and mother-in-law Enwa Devi came there, but in the mean time, other accused persons namely Subhash Yadav, Kapil Yadav, Anil Yadav, Ranjan Yadav and Bodhan Yadav having lashed with iron rod and stick came there and they along with the petitioner assaulted the informant, her husband and her mother-in-law. It is specifically alleged against the petitioner Santosh Yadav that he struck on the head of the husband of the informant by iron rod. Further due to the assault, the informant and her mother-in-law got injury on their hand. The gold chain of the mother-in-law of informant was also snatched by the petitioner Santosh Yadav.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner has clean antecedent. The allegation against the petitioner is that he outraged the modesty of informant and assaulted on the head of husband of the informant by iron rod but corresponding injury of husband of the informant is simple in nature.

5. The learned P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer

of anticipatory bail and submitted that there is serious allegation against the petitioner that he tried to commit rape to the informant and further alongwith other accused persons assaulted the informant, her mother-in-law and husband who got severe injuries on their person, and informant and her mother- in-law have got grievous injuries, whereas nature of injury of the husband of the informant is simple.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and further considering the particular fact that there is serious allegation against the petitioner that he outraged the modesty of the informant and he further alongwith other accused persons assaulted the informant and his family members, in which, the informant and her mother-in-law got grievous injuries.

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.