

Shri Shailendra Kumar-1
District & Additional Sessions Judge - 10th, Muzaffarpur.
ABP No. 1250/2026 order dated 15-04-2026
Prince Kumar Vs. State of Bihar

Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge - 10th, Muzaffarpur
ABP No. 1250/2026 Order dated 15-04-2026

1. PRINCE KUMAR S/O MADAN SINGHPETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF BIHARO.P

(Arising out of Mithanpura P.S. Case No. 334/2025 u/ss 318(4), 338, 336(2), 340(2)
& 61(2) r/w Section 3(5) of the BNS and Section 10 of the Bihar Conduct of
Examination Act, 1981.)

Ld. Counsel on behalf of petitioner :-	Shri Priya Ranjan
Ld. Counsel for the State :-	Shri Sunil Kumar, (Ld. A.P.P.)

ORDER

15-04-2026 1. An Anticipatory bail petition dated **24.03.2026** along with power and certified copy of the documents has been filed on behalf of petitioner who is apprehending his arrest in connection with **Mithanpura P.S. Case No. 334/2025, dated 10.12.2025 u/ss 318(4), 338, 336(2), 340(2) & 61(2) r/w Section 3(5) of the BNS and Section 10 of the Bihar Conduct of Examination Act, 1981.** Heard the learned counsel **Shri Priya Ranjan** for the applicant/accused persons and the Ld. Addl. Public Prosecutor, **Shri Sunil Kumar**, on the anticipatory bail application.

2. The prosecution story in brief is that during a competitive examination for the post of Driver Constable, organized by the Central Selection Board of Constables on 10.12.2025, at Examination Centre No. 1418 (Government District School, Muzaffarpur). During a verification process around 11:00 AM, the invigilator, Dolly, identified discrepancies between the admit card, Aadhaar card, and the official attendance sheet of a candidate in Room No. 02. Upon further scrutiny, the individual present, identified as Santosh Kumar, confessed to appearing in the examination as a proxy for the actual candidate, Ranjeet Kumar (Roll No. 1114180057). Following this disclosure, an accomplice named Manish Kumar was also apprehended at the scene by the stationed police personnel.

3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has been submitted on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case by the informant

Court of District & Additional Sessions Judge - 10th, Muzaffarpur
ABP No. 1250/2026 Order dated 15-04-2026

due to misconception and confusion. No earlier bail has been preferred either before this Court or the Hon'ble Court. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. The petitioner is not named in FIR and his name came in the supervision note of S.P Town, Muzaffarpur with an allegation that this petitioner has put roll no. etc. of co-accused Ranjeet Kumar in his OMR sheet. The entire allegations as alleged in this case against the petitioner are false and fabricated. The petitioner has not committed any forgery and had no connection with the co-accused. The petitioner entered the facts in his OMR sheet as per his knowledge and not under any conspiracy. The petitioner neither Prayed for bail.

4. On the other hand Ld. A.P.P. has vehemently opposed the prayer of bail.

5. Heard both the parties and perused the case record. From the perusal of the record and case diary it appears that the petitioner was not named in FIR but his name has been indulged in this case during investigation. According to para 72 of the case diary, the petitioner has mentioned name of the co-accused Ranjit Kumar over his OMR sheet which is showing that the petitioner is one of the main culprit of the gang of these setters. The petitioner is one of the member of this organized crime of robbing merit of real aspirants. So, in my view, the petitioner does not deserve facility of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant the bail to the petitioner namely **PRINCE KUMAR**. Hence, accordingly, his anticipatory bail petition is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

SD/-

Additional Sessions Judge – X
Muzaffarpur