

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 447/2026/ Filing No. 1902/2026)**

In re:

1. Govind Bind, aged 18 years,
S/o Manika Bind,
2. Sonu Bind @ Rakesh Kumar, aged 25 years,
S/o Shankar Bind,
3. Ashok Bind @ Ashok Kumar, aged 26 years,
S/o Shankar Bind,
4. Shiv Avatar Bind, aged 47 years,
S/o Late Ganesh Bind,
5. Ram Avadh Bind, aged 40 years,
S/o Late Ganesh Bind,
6. Ram Akbal Bind, aged 52 years,
S/o Markandey Bind,
7. Shivanand Bind, aged 37 years,
S/o Late Butan Bind,
8. Bihari Bind, aged 43 years,
S/o Babban Bind,
9. Maniraka Bind, aged 51 years,
S/o Surat Bind,
10. Pratap Bind, aged 35 years,
S/o Nandlal Bind,
11. Pawan Bind, aged 21 years,
S/o Shambhu Bind,
All R/o Vill- Nibikala, P.S- Bhabua, Distt.-Kaimur (Bhabua)

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 221/2026
P.S : Bhabua
U/s: 126(2),115(2),118,109,303(2),
352,351(2),3(5)BNS
Date Of Order: 16.05.2026

-
1. Heard Smt. Kumari Jyoti, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused/petitioners and Sh. Sachidanand Rai, learned P.P. for State.
 2. Petitioners have stated in para 2 of their bail petition that no other bail petition, either anticipatory or regular has been filed/pending except this, either in this court or before Hon'ble High Court at Patna.
 3. The case of prosecution is that accused Govind Bind, Manirka Bind and Sonu Bind used to cross the door of informant under inebriated condition on their motorcycle without silencer and creat-

ing nuisance and when informant objected, they have pushed her due to which she received injury over left hand, accused Sonu Bind have snatched gold chain from her neck and on hearing the noise, her sons came to her rescue but all the FIR named accused including these petitioners have assaulted them with lathi, danda, iron rod & baishakhi, and injure them.

4. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that they are innocent, have not committed any offence and have been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the co-villagers have sorted out the matter between the parties and a compromise agreement is also filed on record. It is therefore, prayed that their anticipatory bail petition may please be allowed.
5. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.
6. Heard both the parties and perused the record. It transpires from the perusal of record that petitioners are FIR named and allegation against them are that these petitioners along with other FIR named accused were creating nuisance and when informant objected, they have beaten her and her family members. The injury report of the injured are mentioned in para 30 of case diary showing abrasion, bruise and scratch mark which are simple in nature caused by HBS. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 19 of case diary. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that allegation against them are general in nature and from the nature of accusation read with injury report, no case U/s 109 BNS is made out against them and accusation of snatching jewelry article appears to be super-addition. It is further submitted that a compromise has also arrived between the parties with the intervention of villagers. A copy of compromise agreement is also filed on record.
7. Considering the aforesaid fact and circumstances of the case, this anticipatory bail petition is **allowed** and in the event of their arrest or surrender within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, these petitioners shall be released on bail on their furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of trial court, subject to conditions as laid down u/s 482 of the BNSS. (Dictated)

Sd/- Anurag.
Sessions Judge