



In the Court of **PUNEET KUMAR GARG**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Bail Petition No. 1187 of 2026 (Pahleja P.S. Case No. 87/2026)
Jainath Pandit V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	02.07.2026	1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on bail petition of petitioner-accused, namely, Jainath Pandit, who has been in judicial custody since 11.06.2026, in this Pahleja P.S. Case No. 87/2026, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 303(2), 109(1), 352 & 351(2) r/w 3(5) of the BNS, pending in the Court of <i>Shri Rakesh Ranjan</i>, learned JMFC, Saran at Chapra. 2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of a typed application of the informant, namely, <i>Nand Kishore Pandit</i>, stating that on 12.04.2026 at about 07:00 P.M., the petitioners-accused along with other accused persons, being armed with lathi, danda, chhura, katta and iron rod, formed an unlawful assembly and surrounded him at his house. It is alleged that they abused the informant in filthy language and threatened him regarding participation in the tender process of <i>Sonu Sah</i>. Upon protest, on the order of the petitioner-accused, the co-accused, <i>Satish Kumar Pandit</i>, allegedly assaulted, <i>Manoj Kumar Pandit</i>, with a sharp-edged weapon, the co-accused, <i>Rajnath Pandit</i> assaulted <i>Ajay Pandit</i> with an iron rod, <i>Anita Devi</i> allegedly caused injury to <i>Kaushalya Devi</i> by chhura on her left hand, the co-accused, <i>Suraj Pandit</i>, snatched the <i>mangalsutra</i> of <i>Kaushalya Devi</i> and thereafter all the accused persons assaulted the informant and his family members by lathi and danda. 3. It is contended on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused that he is quite innocent, and has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and has falsely been implicated in this case due to previous land enmity. Next asserted that earlier no any regular or anticipatory bail petition has been filed or moved on behalf of the petitioner-accused either in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case and he has got clean antecedent except this one. The petitioner-accused has been in judicial custody since 11.06.2026. Next added there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner-accused. Next asserted that this case is the counter blast to Pahleja P.S. Case No. 88/2026. Next added that the doctor has found simple injuries on the person of the injured. Next submitted that the petitioner-accused is ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner-accused may be enlarged on bail. 4. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner-accused. 5. Heard both the sides and perused the materials available on record including the case diary. From the same, it appears that the allegations against	



In the Court of **PUNEET KUMAR GARG**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Bail Petition No. 1187 of 2026 (Pahleja P.S. Case No. 87/2026)
 Jainath Pandit V/s State of Bihar

O R D E R

		the petitioner-accused are grave and specific in nature. The FIR discloses that the petitioner-accused, along with other co-accused persons, formed an unlawful assembly, being variously armed with deadly weapons and surrounded the informant. It is specifically alleged that on the exhortation and command of the petitioner-accused, the co-accused launched a violent assault upon the informant and his family members. Furthermore, the earlier bail application of the co-accused of this case, being BP No. 832/2026, was rejected by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 22.05.2026 with liberty to renew the prayer for bail after submission of the charge-sheet. Thereafter, after filing of the charge-sheet, the renewed bail application being BP No. 998/2026 was allowed by this Court <i>vide</i> order dated 01.06.2026. 6. Therefore, considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, the seriousness of accusation, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, this Court does not find it a fit case for granting bail to the petitioner-accused at this stage. <u>However, the petitioner-accused is at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after the submission of the charge-sheet.</u> 7. Accordingly, this Bail Petition, bearing No. 1187 of 2026, of the petitioner-accused, namely, Jainath Pandit, is hereby rejected. [Dictated] (Puneet Kumar Garg), Sessions Judge, Saran 02.07.2026	