

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

Anticipatory Bail Petition (A.B.P.) No. 217/ 2026

(Arising from Tariyani Chhapra P.S. Case No. 13/2026 U/s. 103(1), 3(5) B.N.S.)

Nandlal Mahto, aged about 76 yrs,

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Bihar.....Opposite Party

Appearance -

For the Petitioner : Sri Dhramendra Kumar Singh, Advocate.

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

ORDER

26.05.2026

The learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor have been heard at length. Perused the up to date copy of L.C.R.

This petition for grant of anticipatory bail was filed on 11.05.2026 on behalf of the above-named petitioner who apprehends arrest in connection with Tariyani Chhapra P.S. Case No. 13/2026 registered on 03.03.2026 U/s. 103(1), 3(5) 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

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 217/ 2026
Nandlal Mahto Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

26.05.2026 neck and chest, and the intestines were protruding from the stomach. It is 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 petitioner has not previously filed any anticipatory bail petition before this Court or Hon'ble Patna High Court, and in para 3 that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It is further argued and submitted that the petitioner is innocent and falsely implicated in this case on account of village politics and there was no concrete evidence against the petitioners. 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 and punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and with fine.

Now, it transpires from perusal of record that the petitioner is 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 due to cardio pulmonary arrest relating to incised injury which damaged vital organs. It is notable from para 16 that the main accused Arun Kumar had

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

Present – Aditya Pandey, District & Additional Sessions Judge

**A.B.P. No. 217/ 2026
Nandlal Mahto Vs. State of Bihar**

ORDER

26.05.2026 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 during the investigation. The nail clips, blood sample, clothes, foot wear, etc. of the deceased have been sent for forensic examination and the report is awaited. It is also notable that the case was found true against three of the co-accused and charge-sheet has been filed under section 238, 61(2), 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S. However, the investigation is continuing against the petitioner.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, I do not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. 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**