

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**Regular Bail Petition (B.P.) No. 61 / 2026**  
(*Arising from Tariyani Chhapra P.S. Case No. 13/2026,*  
*U/s. 103(1), 3(5), 61(2), 238 of the B.N.S.)*

1. Vinay Kumar @ Vinay Mahto, aged about 46 yrs
2. Mintu Mahto, aged about 40 yrs

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

---

**Appearance -**

For the Petitioners : Sri Dhramendra Kumar Singh, Advocate

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

---

**ORDER**

**26.05.2026**

Heard the learned advocate for the petitioners and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor at length. Perused the copy of the L.C.R.

This petition for grant of regular bail was filed jointly on behalf of the above-named petitioners who are in custody since 04.03.2026 in connection with Tariyani Chhapra P.S. Case No. 13/2026 registered on 03.03.2026 under sections 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S.

The prosecution's case in brief is that at 16:05 P.M. on 02.03.2026, when the informant's husband Vinod Rai was at home in village Gangadharam pur, Arun Kumar arrived and took her husband away on the pretext of going to market. It is stated that when her husband did not return until 20:05 P.M. the informant's family members started looking for him and even called up Arun Kumar on his mobile but he told that he had come to his fuaa's place in village Gidha, and the informant then reported the incident to police. It is alleged that on 03.03.2026 at 10:10 A.M. while looking for her husband, the informant and other villagers came across his dead body in a wheat field south of Gangadhrampur High School, and that the dead body had knife marks on neck and chest, and the intestines were protruding from the stomach. It is

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**B.P. No. 61/ 2026**

**Vinay Kumar @ Vinay Mahto & Anr. Vs. State of Bihar**

**ORDER**

**26.05.2026** further alleged that Arun Kumar had called and taken away the informant's husband to orchard where he, Vinay Kumar, Mintu Mahto and Nandlal Mahto murdered him with knife and concealed the dead body in the wheat field.

It is also alleged that Arun Kumar had been threatening to avenge the murder of his father. It has been averred at the outset in para 2 of the petition that the petitioners have not moved any bail petition either before this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna earlier in this case and in para 3 that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent. The learned advocate for the petitioners has further argued and submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case due to dirty village politics and on mere suspicion. There is no concrete evidence against them to complete the chain of circumstances. It is thus prayed that the petitioners may be released on bail.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the bail petition mainly on the ground that charge-sheet has been filed against the petitioners in this case under section 238, 61(2), 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S. which pertained to serious and non-bailable offences punishable with death or imprisonment for life and with fine.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the petitioners are named as accused in this case and the allegations have been broadly supported by the informant and three other witnesses in their statements recorded during the investigation. The post-mortem report of the deceased victim has been recorded in para 39 of the case-diary, according to which the cause of death is cardio pulmonary arrest relating to incised injury which damaged vital organs. It is notable from para 16 that the main accused Arun Kumar had made a confessional statement regarding the murder of the informant's husband and from para 18 that the weapon of offence was recovered upon his disclosure which was duly seized. The nail clips, blood sample, clothes, foot wear, etc. of the deceased have been sent for forensic examination and the report is awaited. Meanwhile, the case was found true against the petitioners and another and charge-sheet was filed under section 238, 61(2), 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S.

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**B.P. No. 61/ 2026**

**Vinay Kumar @ Vinay Mahto & Anr. Vs. State of Bihar**

**ORDER**

**26.05.2026**            In view of the above facts and circumstances, and also considering the nature and gravity of offence and severity of punishment, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. As such, the prayer is **rejected**.

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