

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

Anticipatory Bail Petition (A.B.P.) No. 175 / 2026

(Arising from Shyampur Bhataha P.S. Case No. 80/2026 U/s.140(3), 87, 3(5) B.N.S.)

1. Jitendra Kumar, aged about 30 yrs,
2. Vibha Kumari, aged about 27 yrs,
3. Sakil Ansari, aged about 32 yrs,

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

Appearance -

For the Petitioners : Sri Yogendra Sah, Sri Amit Kumar, Advocates

For the State : Sri Arshad Siddiqui, Addl. Public Prosecutor, Sheohar.

For the Informant : Sri Ajay Kumar Jha, Advocate.

ORDER

14.05.2026

The learned advocates for the petitioners and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor assisted by learned advocate for the informant have been heard at length. Perused the up to date copy of the case diary.

This petition for grant of anticipatory bail was filed on 16.04.2026 on behalf of the above-named three petitioners who apprehend arrest in connection with Shyampur Bhataha P.S. Case No. 80/2026 registered on 02.04.2026 U/s. 140(3), 87, 3(5) B.N.S.

The prosecution's case in brief is that at about 10:00 A.M. on 20.03.2026, the informant's wife Aasma Khatoon had gone to Nayagaon bazaar to get a photocopy of her Aadhar Card and while she was returning the above-named three petitioners and four other unknown persons, forcibly took her in a vehicle and kidnapped her. It is alleged that the accused had kidnapped her with an intent to sell or murder her.

It has been averred at the outset in para 2 of the petition that the petitioners have not previously filed any anticipatory bail petition before this

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 175 / 2026
Jitendra Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

14.05.2026 Court or Hon'ble High Court, and in para 3 that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent. It is further argued and submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case on account of village politics. As a matter of fact, the informant had taken loan from the first petitioner and when he demanded the money back, this false case was instituted against them. It is therefore, prayed that the petitioners may be granted privilege of anticipatory bail.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail petition mainly on the ground that there is credible evidence to suggest the petitioners' involvement in commission of offence which is serious and non-bailable in nature, triable by the Sessions Court and punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to ten years and with fine.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the allegations have been supported by the informant and another witness in their statements as recorded during the investigation. It is notable that in her statement recorded under section 183 of the B.N.S.S. (para 33) the victim has specifically named Jitendra Kumar and Sakil Ansari as involved in her exploitation, commission of rape after drugging, making indecent video and also in threatening her against taking recourse of law. Thus the material on record is suggestive of their involvement in the occurrence, and the investigation remains pending at present. On the other hand, nothing concrete has been brought up on behalf of the two petitioners to suggest that they have been falsely implicated in the case. As regards the second-petitioner namely, Vibha Kumari, she is the wife of the first-named petitioner, and it is clear that she has been neither named by the victim in her statement nor there is any other specific material so far to support the allegations against her as made in the F.I.R.

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - IV
DISTRICT – SHEOHAR**

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 175 / 2026
Jitendra Kumar & Ors. Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

14.05.2026 In view of the above facts and circumstances, I do not find it a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners namely **Jitendra Kumar** and **Sakil Ansari**. As such their prayer is hereby **rejected**.

However, taking into account the general nature of allegations and lack of specific material so far, I find it reasonable and proper to allow the prayer made on behalf of second-petitioner, namely Vibha Kumari. This petitioner is accordingly ordered to be enlarged in the event of arrest / surrender **within two weeks of receipt of the order** on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of **Rs.10,000** with **two sureties of like amount each** to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court, subject to **filing of undertaking in terms of section 482 (2) B.N.S.S.**

Let a copy of this order be sent to the learned trial Court for information and needful.

(Dictated & Corrected)

Sd/-

**Addl. Sessions Judge, IV
Sheohar**