

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali.
A.B.P. No. 1035/2026

Ankit Kumar, aged about 23 years S/o Mukesh Sharma
Resident of village –Jatkauli, P.S. - Vaishali, Distt. - Vaishali.

-	Petitioner
Verses	
State of Bihar	O.P.

Appearance :-

Learned counsel for the petitioner :- Sri Alok Swami, advocate.

Learned P.P. for the State :- Sri Shyam Babu Rai,

Present : Harshit Singh,
Sessions Judge, Vaishali.

Date of order : 16th. April 2026

ORDER

Heard the learned defence counsel as well as learned Public Prosecutor for the State on the anticipatory bail application filed on behalf of the above named accused petitioner under section 482 of B.N.S.S. who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Vaishali P.S. Case No. 56/2026 registered u/ss. 329(3), 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 324(4), 352, 351(2), 3(5) of B.N.S..

It is stated in Para 2 of the anticipatory bail petition that no bail application either anticipatory or regular has been filed in the present case either before this court of Sessions or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna.

The case of the prosecution in brief, as per fardbayan of informant Prince Raj is that on 16.01.2026 at about 11.30 A.M **Ankit Kumar** and Mukesh Sharma were filling soil at his door with intent to grab his land. When the informant protested, accused **Ankit Kumar** gave lathi to his father Mukesh Sharma. **Ankit** was with Hasua and he repeatedly assaulted with Hasua on informant's head

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali.

A.B.P. No.1035/2026

(Ankit Kumar Vs. State of Bihar)

Contd.16.04.2026

causing cut injury. Mukesh Sharma started pressing his neck. When his father came, accused Mukesh Sharma snatched mobile and damaged the said mobile.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner accused is innocent and has not committed any offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to land dispute. There is no specific allegation against him. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Hence, prayer has been made for anticipatory bail.

Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

Heard the parties and also perused the record and case diary. From perusal of the record and case diary, it appears that there is specific allegation of repeatedly assaulting the informant with Hasua against the accused petitioner Ankit Kumar. The informant in his re-statement in Para 2 and other witnesses namely Rakesh Kumar, Nandkishore Singh and Amrita Devi in Para 5, 6 & 7 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. The investigation is still going on. The injury report of injured Prince Raj shows that he has **sustained** :

- (i) (8 x 1 x 0.5) cm laceration present on left side of scalp along the parieto-temporal suture line.
- (ii) (7 x 1 x 0.5) cm laceration present near vertex towards right side towards occipital region.
- (iii) Bruise of (4x2) cm present over right side of neck.

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Vaishali.

A.B.P. No.1035/2026

(Ankit Kumar Vs. State of Bihar)

Contd.16.04.2026

Radiology report suggestive of fracture at tip of B/L nasal bone.

The weapon/substance used – Hard and blunt. The doctor has opined that the nature of injury is **grievous**.

Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts, circumstances of the case as well as nature of the allegations, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail petition is hereby rejected.

(Dictated)

(Harshit Singh)
Sessions Judge, Vaishali

Date of Order	16.04.2026
Date of Uploading	18.04.2026
Uploaded by	N.K.