

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, SARAN (CHAPRA)
Anticipatory Bail Petition No.- 4504/2025
(Dariyapur P.S. Case No.- 650 of 2025)

Nunu Manjhi & Others.....Petitioner/s
 Versus
 The State of BiharProsecution

Order	
25.03.2026	<p>1. This anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf on the accused petitioners namely 1. Nunu Manjhi, 2. Deo Kumar Manjhi, 3. Pankaj Manjhi, 4. Pinki Devi and 5. Surati Devi @ Khubsurati Devi who apprehending their arrest in connection with Dariyapur P.S. Case No.- 650/25, registered u/s 140(3) & 3(5) of BNS which is pending in the Ld. court of Smt. Saumya Suman, J.M. 1st Class, Saran at Chapra. Copy of the petition has been served to the learned P.P.</p> <p>2. The case of the prosecution in nut-shell as per written petition of the informant, Paras Manjhi is that the informant's daughter, Mamita Kumari was married with Pavan Manjhi as per Hindu customs and traditions. It has been ten years since their marriage and they have four children. It is alleged that ever since the marriage, she has been harassed by her in-laws, sometimes, they used to demand money, vehicle or sometime jewelry and they used to harass her daily, her daughter was attempted to be murdered many times . It is further alleged that her husband, Pavan Manjhi repeatedly threatened her to marry with another women. On 04.10.2025 at 11:00 A.M, when the informant went to the daughter's <i>Sasural</i> , she was not present there and, on seeing him, the family members of her in-laws house started fleeing away from home. Further, the informant alleged that he is assured of the fact that 1. Pavan Manjhi, 2. Nunu Manjhi, 3. Deo Kumar Manjhi, 4. Pankaj Manjhi, 5. Surati Devi and 6. Pinki Devi, all the persons together made her daughter missing.</p> <p>3. The learned counsel on behalf of the petitioners submitted that they are quite innocent, committed no offence and have been falsely implicated in this case due to suspicion. That the petitioners are other than husand and they are separated from the Pawan Manjhi. It is further submitted that previously no A.B.P or B.P. has ever been filed by the petitioner before the Sessions Judge of</p>

cont.

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-IV, SARAN (CHAPRA)
Anticipatory Bail Petition No.- 4504/2025
(Dariyapur P.S. Case No.- 650 of 2025)

Nunu Manjhi & Others.....Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of BiharProsecution

continued..
25.03.2026

Saran at Chapra or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna. There is no criminal antecedent of the accused petitioner. That the petitioners are abide to ready all the conditions laid down by the court u/s 482 of the BNSS. Hence, he prayed to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

4. Learned PP oppose the bail petition vehemently.

5. Heard learned counsel on behalf of the accused petitioners and learned P.P. for the state, perused case diary and material available on the record. As per allegation, the daughter of the informant is still missing and has not been recovered during the investigation. The investigating regarding this case is still pending.

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, the court reaches on conclusion, the accused petitioners are not entitled for grant anticipatory bail. Therefore, the anticipatory bail petition filed on behalf of accused petitioners is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated and corrected by me)

Sd/-

(Raghvendra Vikram Singh Parmar)

Additional Sessions Judge-IV, Saran

25.03.2026