

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Regular Bail Application No. 670 of 2026

Mahangu Kumar Vs State of Bihar

Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2026

Order dated: 16.04.2026

ORDER

16.04.2026

The present Regular Bail Application has been preferred by Petitioner namely **Mahangu Kumar** s/o Vijay Bind who is in judicial custody since 01.02.2026 in connection with Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2026 under Section 69 of BNS pending in the Court of Ld. C.J.M., Munger. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner is present on calling and Learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State is also present.

As per the Bail Application, it is submitted that the Petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence and falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the reality informant's brother-in-law had come 6 months ago with the proposal of marrying his sister-in-law, since then he was continuously putting pressure on the Petitioner. The Petitioner knew her character and the Informant had relations with many boys and the Petitioner refused his proposal. The FIR submitted is the process of this. The informant is a cunning woman, she tries to exploit the money by making similar allegation and file a false case against the person who does not pay the money. The Informant also filed a similar case against the Avinash Kumar s/o Krishandeo Paswan in the year 2024 vide Dharahara P.S. Case No. 264 of 2024. That there is abnormal delay in lodging the FIR but no any reasonable or unreasonable explanation has been advanced regarding the delay and under Section 69 of BNS is not attracting against the Petitioner. In para-2 of the Application, it is certified that the Petitioner has not previously filed any Bail Application before this Court or before Hon'ble High Court of Patna. The Petitioner have no criminal antecedent.

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Regular Bail Application No. 670 of 2026

Mahangu Kumar Vs State of Bihar

Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2026

Order dated: 16.04.2026

The Petitioner is ready to furnish the bail bond and he is also ready to comply with direction of this Court. Hence, it is prayed to enlarge the Petitioner on Bail.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the present Bail Application.

As per the written statement of the prosecution story is that the Informant namely Varsha Kumari alleged on 30.01.2026 at about 02:00 PM that the Petitioner Mahangu Kumar made physical relationship with Informant for one year ago and further he denied for marriage with Informant.

Heard both sides and perused the records.

From the perusal of the case record, it is clear that the Petitioner is sole named accused person in FIR and there is direct allagation to make physical relationship with Informant on the promise of marriage but he denied for marriage. All prosecution witnesses in paras-5, 36, 41, 42, 86 & 94 of the case diary have supported the case of prosecution. Para-23 of the case diary contained statement of victim under Section 183 of BNSS in which she has supported the case of prosecution. Para-107 of the case diary contained the concened Investigating Officer after completion of investigation has submitted charge-sheet under Section 69 of BNS against the Petitioner as well as the Court below taken cognizance in same section against the Petitioner on 02.04.2026. The Petitioner is in judicial custody since 01.02.2026.

Therefore, considering aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as discussed above, nature of the allegation, present status of this

**IN THE COURT OF
DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I
MUNGER, BIHAR**

Regular Bail Application No. 670 of 2026

Mahangu Kumar Vs State of Bihar

Basudeopur P.S. Case No. 10 of 2026

Order dated: 16.04.2026

case, submission of charge-sheet against the Petitioner as well as taking of cognizance in same section by Court below, period of custody, I am of the view that there is direct allegation against the Petitioner to make physical relationship with Informant on the promise of marriage and later on refused to marry her. The Petitioner is sole accused person in this case. Hence, the Petitioner does not deserve the privilege of bail at this point of time.

Accordingly, the prayer of bail of the Petitioner namely **Mahangu Kumar is hereby Rejected with direction that the Petitioner has liberty to renew his bail application after framing of charge.**

Dictated,

Sd/-

District & Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Munger

Dated: 16.04.2026

Date of Order/Judgement	16.04.2026
Uploading Date	22.04.2026
Uploaded By	Neeraj Kumar Pandey (Steno)