

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 481/2026/ Filing No. 2096/2026)**

In re:

1. Parmeshwar Paswan @ Madhuranjan Paswan, aged about 20 years,
S/o Mantu Paswan,
2. Dhanji Paswan, aged about 19 years,
S/o Late Anil Paswan,
3. Pankaj Paswan, aged about 31 years,
S/o Late Bihari Paswan,
4. Shashi Paswan, aged about 25 years,
D/o Late Bhikhari Paswan,
5. Upendra Paswan, aged about 35 years,
S/o Late Bhikhari Paswan,
6. Chitranjan Paswan, aged about 20 years,
S/o Jitendra Paswan,
7. Bhagwan Paswan, aged about 28 years,
S/o Bechan Paswan,
8. Chhotu Paswan, aged about 20 years,
S/o Satyendra Paswan,
9. Vitu Paswan, aged about 21 years,
S/o Mohan Paswan,
10. Sonu Paswan, aged about 25 years,
S/o Gaurakh Paswan,
11. Bivek Paswan, aged about 21 years,
S/o Bijay Paswan,
12. Aday Paswan, aged about 40 years,
S/o Bigau Paswan,
13. Mantu Paswan, aged about 46 years,
S/o Late Bhim Paswan,
All R/o- Bhabua Ward No.-25, PS- Bhabua, Distt.-Kaimur (Bhabua).

V/s

STATE

FIR No: 87/2026

P.S : Bhabua

**U/s: 126(2),115(2),109,303(2),352,
351(2),3(5)BNS**

Date Of Order: 16.04.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Satyendra Prasad Pandey , learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused/petitioners and Sh. Sachidanand Rai, learned PP 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. Alleging false implication of the petitioners, it is submitted on their behalf that both the parties are residents of same *mohalla* and this case is outcome of differences cropped up between the parties on the use of common lane to reach their respective houses, however, the injury sustained by the injured are simple in nature caused by HBS and thus the submission is that no case for the offence U/s 109 (1) of BNS is made out and the allegation U/s 303 (2) is super-addition.
4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.
5. Heard both the parties and perused the record. It transpires from the perusal of record that petitioners are FIR named and allegation against them as per FIR are that on dated 01.02.2026 at around 08:00 PM, the informant was going to his old house from the new one and when he reached near pokhra, all the accused/petitioners came having weapon in their hands and surrounded him and thereafter, assaulted him and snatched money and other valuables from his father when he came to his rescue. The injury report of injured is attached with case diary showing abrasion and pain which is simple in nature caused by hard and blunt object as mentioned in para 28 of the case diary Petitioner No. 3,4,5 and 9 have criminal antecedent of two cases each and Petitioner No. 6 and Petitioner No. 7 have criminal antecedent of one case and they are stated to be on bail in all those cases. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that both informant and petitioners are residents of the same locality and they used to quarrel with each other regarding the common passage and from the nature of accusation read with injury report, no case U/s 109 BNS is made out against them and allegation of taking away valuables appears to be super-addition.
6. 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