

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, DANAPUR
BAIL PETITION NO. 220 OF 2026
(Arising out of Danapur P.S. Case No. 1174 of 2026)

Jaiki Kumār alias Jhappu, aged about 26 years, s/o Rajesh Kumar Chaudhry, r/o- Vill. Bibiganj, Tari Godown, Ward No. 18, P.S. Danapur, Distt. Patna

Vs.

.....Petitioners

The State of Bihar..... O.P.

=====

Appearance;- For the Petitioners; Sri Ghanshyam Tiwari (Adv.)
For the Opposite Party; Sri Kalam Ansari (Addl. P.P.)

Present: - Naghma Tarannum, Addl. Sessions Judge-04, Danapur

ORDER

06..03.2026

1. The present application for bail, dated 18.02.2026, has been moved on behalf of the petitioner/accused Jaiki Kumar alias Jhappu, who is in judicial custody since 13.11.2025 in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 1174/2026, registered for the offences punishable under Section 304, 317(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State. Perused the materials available on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. It is contended that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of this accused. There was some altercation between the tempo driver and the petitioner for overtaking, and the petitioner was assaulted by the tempo driver and other passengers and implicated him in false and fabricated case. That the petitioner has one criminal case against him in which he is on bail, he undertakes to abide by all conditions imposed by the Court.
4. Per contra, learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail, submitting that though the offence may appear to be simple in nomenclature, the alleged occurrence is

Contd.

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, DANAPUR
BAIL PETITION NO. 220 OF 2026
(Arising out of Danapur P.S. Case No. 1174 of 2025)

06-03-2026

very serious in nature, because the accused was caught while snatching away a mobile phone of a passenger. The petitioner is having a criminal case of similar nature, hence does not deserve the privilege of bail at this stage.

5. At the stage of consideration of bail, a detailed appreciation of evidence is neither warranted nor desirable. The Court, however, is duty-bound to consider the nature and gravity of accusation, the materials collected, the stage of the case, the likelihood of tampering with evidence or influencing witnesses, the possibility of absconding, and whether further custodial detention is necessary.
6. From the materials on record, it prima facie appears that the petitioner was caught while fleeing snatching a mobile phone of a passenger. It is also emerging from para 20 of the case diary that the petitioner is having a criminal antecedent of similar nature. At this stage, the petitioner has not been able to furnish any satisfactory explanation with regard to his false implication in this case. The investigation, as submitted, stands concluded and the petitioner has been charge-sheeted under the aforesaid sections.
7. The nature of accusation, the attendant circumstances reflected in the materials, and the prima facie linkage presently appearing from the record, do not persuade this Court to extend the discretionary relief of bail at this stage.
8. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the prayer for bail of the petitioner Jaiki Kumar @ Jhappu is rejected.

Contd.

IN THE COURT OF ADDL. SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, DANAPUR
BAIL PETITION NO. 220 OF 2026
(Arising out of Danapur P.S. Case No. 1174 of 2025)

06-03-2026

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail at an appropriate stage, if there is any change in circumstances, or if the trial does not proceed with due dispatch.

10. Let this order be communicated to the learned court below forthwith for compliance.

Dictated

Addl. Sessions Judge-04, Danapur