

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE,
KAIMUR AT BHABHUA
(ABP No. 604/2026/ Filing No. 2609/2026)**

In re:

1. Piyush Pandey @ Sailesh Pandey, aged about 40 years,
S/o Late Kameshwar Prasad Pandey,
R/o-Vill- Hata, P.S.-Chainpur, Dist-Kaimur (Bhabhua)

V/s
STATE

FIR No: 152/2026
P.S : Chainpur
U/s: 126(2), 324(4), 333, 308(2),
109(1), 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) BNS
& 25, 27 Arms Act
Date Of Order:18.05.2026

-
1. Heard Sri Roushan Kumar Yadav, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused/petitioner and Sh. Sachidanand Rai, learned P.P. for State.
 2. Petitioner has stated in para 2 of his 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. It is submitted on behalf of petitioners that he is innocent, has not committed any such offence and has been falsely implicated in this case due to village politics and enmity. It is further submitted that on dated 31.03.2026, a tender of Hata Bazar was going to be opened in the Conference Hall in the Hata Nagar Panchayat and 20-25 persons were present in the Hall and in the meantime, someone has fired in the air and name of this petitioner was wrongly given in this case due to village politics. It is, therefore, prayed that his bail petition may be allowed.
 4. Learned PP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of this petitioner stating that there is specific allegations against this petitioner of firing in the Hall and an empty cartage was also recovered from the Hall.
 5. Heard the arguments of both the parties and perused the case record. It transpires from the perusal of record that petitioner is FIR named and allegations against him

as per FIR are that on dated 31.03.2026 at around 4:00 PM, two persons entered the Hall of Nagar Panchayat, Hata and this petitioner pulled out a pistol from his waist and fired upon the employee of Hata. The bullet hit the wall of community hall and an empty cartridge was also recovered from the Hall. This petitioner was identified from the CCTV footage of the Hall. Petitioner has criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 52 of case diary, four more cases of similar nature are pending against him. Allegations against him are serious and investigation against him is still pending.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to give him the benefit of anticipatory bail. Hence, this anticipatory bail petition is **dismissed**. (Dictated)

Sd/- Anurag
Sessions Judge