

**IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & A.S.J.-II, VAISHALI AT HAJIPUR**

**A.B.P. NO. 2152 of 2025**

**CNR No. BRVA01-007863-2025**

**Arising out Goraul P.S. Case No. 352/2025**

**U/s – 103 of B.N.S**

=====  
**Sanjiv Kumar, S/o: Surendra Thakur**

.....

**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**The State of Bihar**

.....

**Opposite Party**

=====  
**Appearance :**

**For the petitioner**

**: Sri Rajesh Kumar, Gyanendra Kr., Sujeet  
Kr., Ld. Adv.**

**For the State**

**: Sri Ramnath Mahto, Ld. A.P.P.**

**For the Informant**

**: Sri Krishna Bhusan Singh, Ld. Adv.**

**24.03.2026**

**Order**

1. The anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner-**Sanjiv Kumar**, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with aforesaid case, **Goraul P.S. Case No. 352/2025, U/s – 103 of B.N.S**

2. The Ld. Advocate on behalf of the petitioner pressed the anticipatory bail petition and submitted that the petitioner has not moved any kind of bail earlier before Ld. This Court or Hon'ble High Court and first time moved his prayer for anticipatory bail before Ld. This Court. That so far criminal antecedent of petitioner is concern one case bearing Mahua P.S. Case No. 705/2024, U/s 126(2), 331, 352, 115(2), 303(2), 351, 3(5) of B.N.S. is pending against petitioner in which petitioner has been granted bail by Ld. Lower Court. That on the basis of written report given by informant S.H.O. of Goraul P.S. has registered this case as mahus p.s. case no. 352 of 2025 on 20.06.2025 for the offences mentioned here in above. That the petitioner is quite innocent has not committed any offences what so ever and he has falsely been implicated in this case due to dirty village politics. That the entire allegation alleged against petitioner is false and concocted in fact petitioner has played no role in the alleged occurrence and only on the basis

<p><b>24.03.2026</b></p>	<p>of suspicious petitioner has been implicated in this case. That the informant is not an eye witness of the alleged occurrence which is quite perusal of F.I.R. itself. That after perusal of F.I.R. it appears that there is no motive behind the occurrence rather only on the basis of suspicion name of petitioner has been implicated in this case. That in the F.I.R. it is alleged that petitioner has given threatening to kill son of informant (deceased) but neither informant nor deceased has registered any case nor given any information to any police personnel all these shows that petitioner is quite innocent any only on the basis of suspicion he has been implicated in this case. That the petitioner is ready to furnish bail bond as per direction of Ld. This Court. That petitioner undertakes that he will not misuse the privilege of anticipatory bail if granted by Ld. This Court.</p> <p>3. The Ld. A.P.P. and Ld. Adv. Of Informant vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail petition, and submitted that the petitioner is named in F.I.R. U/s – 103 of B.N.S, and further investigation is still going on.</p> <p>4. As per written application of the informant-<b>Vipati Devi</b>, the prosecution's case in short is that on 20.06.2025, at around 06:00 am. She received information that her son Sujit Kumar, has been murdered near Rampur Bhorhan and his body has been thrown away. When informant reached Bhorhan village, she saw that her son was lying on the side of the road and his motorcycle had fallen on the road. Sanjeev Kumar, had threatend that his body will lie on cot. Informant has fully confident that his son has been murdered and thrown away.</p> <p>5. Heard both the parties perused the C.D. the accused-petitioner is named in FIR, and as per FIR, there is direct and sepcific allegations against him. In C.D. Para-5 re-statement of informant has been mentioned, in which she supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-6 witness Sanjeev Kumar Sahni's statement is mentioned, he supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-7 witness Phula Devi's statement is mentioned, she supported the</p>
--------------------------	---

24.03.2026

prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-8 witness Gudiya Kumari's statement is mentioned, she supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-9 witness Sanoj Kumar's statement is mentioned, he supported the prosecution's case. In C.D. Para-25 Post-Mortem report of deceased is mentioned, and separately attached with C.D., in this report it is stated that incised wound chin 3 cm x 2 cm x bone deep. Incised wound right inguinal region. 3 cm x 1/2 cm x deep 2 cm., and death is due to shock and haemorrhage due to above mentioned injury. In C.D. Para-22 supervision report of S.D.P.O. Mahua is mentioned, the case is found true against this accused-petitioner U/s 103(1) B.N.S. In C.D. Para-68 it is mentioned that, accused-petitioner is absconding from his house. Further investigation is still going on.

6. Hence, in the light of above said, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticiptory bail to this accused-petitioner, the same is hereby, **Rejected.**

7. O/C will send the copy of this order to concerned Ld. Court below for kind information and needful.

8. The Steno is directed to upload the order on the C.I.S.

District & Addl. Sessions Judge-II,  
Vaishali at Hajipur,  
24.03.2026