

**In the Court of District & Add. Sessions Judge-II,
(Jhanjharpur) Madhubani**

Regular Bail Petition No.283/2026

1. Gaurav Surana aged about 35 years S/o Anil Surana.
 2. Anil Surana aged about 62 years S/o Lakshmi Chand Surana.
- Both R/o Village- Laukahi, PS- Laukahi, District- Madhubani.

.....Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Bihar through Additional Public Prosecutor.

.....Opposite Party

Regular Bail Petition Under Section 483 B.N.S.S.

For the petitioner/s : Shri Rajeev Kr. Jha, Advocate

For the O.P. State : Shri Dev Shankar Jha, APP

O R D E R

Dated: 05.08.2026

This regular bail petition has been filed under section 483 B.N.S.S. on behalf of the petitioners **Gaurav Surana & Anil Surana** who have been arrested in connection with **Laukaha PS Case No.91/2026, GR No.805/2026 under section 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S.** which is pending in the court of S.D.J.M., Jhanjharpur, is being pressed, and heard.

The prosecution case in brief is that on 17.04.2026 at about 7:10 PM, Md. Manjar informed through mobile to the informant's son that his brother Md. Nadim was injured due to the reason of accident by tractor, and his condition is critical. He is admitted in Laukahi Hospital. When informant reached the Laukahi Hospital, his son was on stretcher, and declared dead. At the same time Md. Salim also reached the Hospital, and spoke to the informant, that the deceased Md. Nadim demanded the payment from the petitioners. Then the petitioners assaulted him by iron rod on the head of deceased. He finally stated that the petitioners have killed his son.

Learned counsel for the accused petitioners submits that the accused petitioners are quite innocent, and have not committed any offence, or offences. The prosecution story is totally false, vague, and

concocted. The petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case at the instance of the I.O. Akhilesh Kumar, who happened to the informant of Laukahi P.S. Case No. 204/25 lodged against the petitioners, and against which petitioners preferred a writ petition vide Cr.W.J.C. No. 804/2026 on dated 29.04.2026 before the Hon'ble High Court of Patna, which is under consideration. There is no occurrence as alleged did ever took place. There is no specific allegation against the petitioners. The deceased was a driver of tractor, and he himself sustained the injuries on his person, while driving, and the vehicle turned upside down. He was rescued by passers by, and on getting the knowledge of the accident the petitioners brought him to the hospital for treatment on e-rickshaw. Hence section 103(1) of B.N.S. is not applicable. The story of dues of salary of the deceased against the petitioners are false, and concocted. Since the petitioners are not the owner of said brick kiln, and the deceased was never employee of the petitioners. At the time of occurrence, petitioners were not there, which is clarified by the CCTV footage, where Anil Surana was standing in the shop of Laukahi market for purchasing of chocolate for children. The petitioners were brutally assaulted by the police officials, which is also verified from the record of Ld. SDJM Court, where report of doctor is on record. The petitioners are in custody since 18.04.2026.

The learned APP had opposed the prayer for bail.

Heard the argument and perused the case diary. Petitioners bear one criminal antecedent each. Allegation against the petitioners is that they have murdered deceased by assaulting him. In inquest report mentioned in para-3 of case diary, it has been stated that deceased was firstly assaulted by rod/stick on his head. Witnesses in para-6, 7, 8, and 9, of case diary had also supported the prosecution case. In para-13 and 52 of case diary, it has come out during inspection of place of occurrence, that to show the occurrence as an accident, tractor was damaged. In para-36 of case diary postmortem report is mentioned, which shows cause of death due to hemorrhage and shock, and nature of weapon used is hard and blunt substance. In para-62 of case diary eye witness statement has been recorded u/s 183 BNSS, in which he had supported the allegation of murder by petitioners. In para-86 and 87 of case diary, doctor who had initially treated the deceased had stated that injury on

the body of deceased shows that it is not by any accident. In par-96 report of FSL is there, and in their opinion injuries on deceased are more consistent with an assault. Therefore, the scene findings are suggestive of a homicidal(murder) incident rather than an accidental occurrence. Considering these facts, this Court is not inclined to enlarge petitioners on bail. Hence, bail petition of petitioners namely **Gaurav Surana**, and **Anil Surana**, are hereby **rejected**.

Dictated
Sd/-
**Addl. Sessions Judge-II,
Jhanjharpur**

Memo No...../2026, Dated:.....
Copy of order with LCR forwarded to the court of SDJM, Jhanjharpur for information and needful.

**Addl. Sessions Judge-II,
Jhanjharpur**