

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Dated, Saharsa, the 21th August, 2026

**Present: - Dinesh Sharma, Principal District & Session Judge, Saharsa
B.A. No. 535/2026 (Arising out of Nauhatta P.S. Case No. 179/2025)**

Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha Petitioner Vs State of Bihar

In the matter of:-

**Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha, S/o Late Kapileshwar Jha
Resident of Village Gorpara, Ward No. 01, P.S. Nauhatta, District-Saharsa.**

....Petitioner

Vs

State of Bihar

.....Opposite Party

Appearance:-

For the Petitioner :- Sri Randhir Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the State :- Sri Krishna Murari Prasad, Ld. P.P.

Date of proceeding	Order with the signature of the court	Office action taken with date
21.08.2026	This bail petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner namely Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha, S/o Late Kapileshwar Jha, who is in custody since 17.12.2025 in connection with Nauhatta P.S. Case No. 179/2025 registered under Sections 103(1), 61(2), 303(2), 3(5) of BNS, and 27 of the Arms Act. 2. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned P.P. for the State. 3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the accused petitioner that petitioner had voluntarily surrendered before the learned court on 17.12.2025 since then he is judicial custody. It is further submitted that petitioner bears no criminal antecedent. It is further submitted that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offense and he has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the allegation leveled against the petitioner are false and frivolous. It is further submitted that there is an unexplained delay of two days in lodging of the FIR which clearly indicates false implication as an afterthought. It is further submitted that out of the total eight FIR named accused persons, seven accused have already been enlarged on bail. It is further submitted that petitioner is a man of means and there is no chance of his absconding or tampering with the evidence and he is ready to furnish sound sureties to	

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Dated, Saharsa, the 21th August, 2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, Principal District & Session Judge, Saharsa

B.A. No. 535/2026 (Arising out of Nauhatta P.S. Case No. 179/2025)

Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha Petitioner Vs State of Bihar

<u>Cont/2-</u> <u>21.08.2026</u>	the full satisfaction of the court. Upon these grounds, the learned counsel prays to grant bail to the petitioner. 4. On the other hand, the learned P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer of bail. 5. Rival submissions considered, Record perused. 6. The prosecution case, as per the written application of informant, Alok Kumar Jha, in brief, is that, on 01.09.2025 he was informed by his uncle Umesh Jha regarding an ongoing land survey, prompting the informant's father to arrive at their village, Gaurpara, on 14.09.2025. It is further alleged that informant's father called him to report that Umesh Jha and other accused persons were abusing, harassing, and conspiring against him to kill. Subsequently, around 20:00 hours, the informant received information that accused persons Mani Jha @ Manibhushan Jha, Umesh Jha, Rameshwar Jha, Chandrabhushan Jha, Anil Jha, Sunil Jha, Rupa Devi, and Lalita Devi @ Manisha Devi acting in furtherance of a common conspiracy, abused and assaulted the informant's father, during which Mani Jha shot and killed him, with the remaining accused actively participating in the conspiratorial murder. Furthermore, an amount of ₹5,00,000 and a Samsung mobile phone belonging to the deceased went missing from the scene. 7. The informant of the case is not an eye-witness to the occurrence. In the entire case diary, it is no-where mentioned as to who had informed the informant about the incident and about the role of the accused persons in the incident. 8. Admittedly, there is no investigation with regard to the phone number on which the deceased had allegedly talked with the informant. P.W. Prabha Devi was in Delhi at the time of the incident and had not witnessed the occurrence. P.W. Jyoti Kumari was also not an eye-witness and at the time of incident she was at Gurgaon, Haryana. P.W. Pooja Devi was also in Delhi at the time of incident and had not seen the occurrence. P.W. Sintu Kumar was also in Delhi and had not seen the occurrence.	
-------------------------------------	---	--

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, SAHARSA

Dated, Saharsa, the 21th August, 2026

Present: - Dinesh Sharma, Principal District & Session Judge, Saharsa

B.A. No. 535/2026 (Arising out of Nauhatta P.S. Case No. 179/2025)

Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha Petitioner Vs State of Bihar

Cont/3-
21.08.2026

The other co-accused persons, namely, Umesh Jha, Rameshwar Jha, Chandra Bhushan Jha, Anil Jha, Sunil Jha, Rupa Devi and Lalita Devi @ Manisha Devi have already been granted bail. There is an admitted land dispute between the informant's side and the accused persons. The petitioner is in custody since 17.12.2025. Charge-sheet has been submitted against the petitioner.

9. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the nature of evidence and the fact that other co-accused persons have been released on bail, the prayer for bail of the petitioner Mani Bhushan Jha @ Mani Jha, is hereby **allowed**. The petitioner be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate where the case is presently pending further subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 480(3) of the BNSS.

(Dictated)

Sd./-

(DINESH SHARMA),
Principal Sessions Judge,
Saharsa
21.08.2026

Date of Judgement/Order	21.08.2026
Date of Reserving Judgement/Order	21.08.2026
Uploading Date	27.08.2026
Uploaded by	Sachin Kumar