

In the Court of Sri Sandip Singh, Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui,

B.A.No.498/2026

(Arising out of Khaira P.S. Case No.262/2026)

1.Vinod Yadav S/o Suraj Yadav aged about 40 years resident of village Karkati (Darima)
P.S. Khaira, present P.S. Garhi, District Jamui.

.....**Petitioner**

Vrs.

The State of Bihar**O.P.**

(with)

B.A.No.516/2026

(Arising out of Khaira P.S. Case No.262/2026)

1.Nitish Kumar S/o Late Baudhi Yadav aged about 19 years resident of village Karkatti,
P.S. Garhi, District Jamui.

.....**Petitioner**

Vrs.

The State of Bihar**O.P.**

(with)

B.A.No.565/2026

(Arising out of Khaira P.S. Case No.262/2026)

1.Ranjit Kumar S/o Basudev Yadav @ Baso Yadav aged about 23 years resident of
village Karkati, P.S. Khaira, Present P.S. Garhi, District Jamui.

.....**Petitioner**

Vrs.

The State of Bihar**O.P.**

- 14.8.2026
1. One **regular bail application No.498/2026** has been filed on behalf of the **petitioner Vinod Yadav**, who is in custody since 1.7.2026, **2nd regular bail application No.516/2026** has been filed on behalf of the **petitioner Nitish Kumar** who is in custody since 9.7.2026, and **3rd regular bail application No.565/2026** has been filed on behalf of the **petitioner Ranjit Kumar** who is in custody since 10.7.2026. These three applications arises out of the same case i.e. **Khaira P.S.Case No.262/2026 registered U/s.70(1), 77, 352, 76 and 67(A) of the B.N.S.** pending in the court of C.J.M., Jamui. Hence, they are taken up together for hearing and disposal by a common orders.
 2. Heard Sri Sitaram Singh, Sri Makeswar Prasad Yadav, and Kumar Shashi Shekhar Sinha, the learned counsels for the petitioners and the learned P.P.for the State.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the informant Awdhesh Tanti has lodged the instant case by way of submitting an application before the SHO of Khaira Police Station alleging therein that on 21.6.2026 at about 10 a.m. while the informant's daughter Vibha Kumari was going towards market to buy vegetables, then Subham Kumar Modi and his brother Suman Kumar Modi arrived on a motorcycle and they kidnapped the daughter of the informant after spraying an intoxicating substance on her face. The daughter of the informant regained consciousness and find herself in a forest and a group of 8-10 peoples including the petitioners made her naked and filmed a obscene video, and when she resisted, then Subham Kumar Modi threatened to kill her and her brother. The daughter of the informant any how escaped and returned to her home by evening but she remained weeping. However, on 23.6.2026 the abductors circulated her obscene video on social media. Thereafter, the daughter of the informant tried to commit suicide, but any how she was saved and the instant case was registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners have jointly submitted that the petitioners are innocent and falsely implicated in this case. All the petitioners are not named in the F.I.R.and their name surfaced in this case during investigation. Although the prosecution has invoked section 67(A) of I.T. Act, but there is no any prima-facie material connecting the petitioners with the alleged crime. It is also submitted that the petitioners are made accused in this case only on the basis of suspicion, and one named co-accused Suman Kumar Modi has been granted bail by this court vide an order dated 28.7.2026 passed in B.A. No.513/2026.

5. The learned P.P.for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that petitioner Vinod Yadav (vide B.A.No.498/2026) has one criminal antecedent, whereas, other two petitioners (vide B.A.No.516/2026 and B.A.No.565/2026) have clean antecedent. It is further submitted that the allegation against the petitioners are entirely different from the co-accused Suman Kumar Modi who has been granted bail in this case as it is stated by the victim in her restatement in paragraph 83 of the case diary that the name of Suman Kumar Modi was given as accused due to pressure of the society, but the true fact is that he was reached at the place of the occurrence to save the

victim from the possession of other co-accused. The medical report of victim mentioned in paragraph 122 of the case diary reveals that the victim had undergone sexual intercourse likely.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and further considering the particular fact that though the petitioners are not named in the F.I.R.but against them there is ample material came during investigation which is mentioned in paragraph Nos.15, 21, 25, 73, 80, 83, 84, 122, and 144 of the case diary,and from perusal of those paragraphs, it is clear that all the petitioners are involved in the offence of alleged crime against the victim Bibha Kumari. The medical report clearly shows that the victim had undergone sexual intercourse likely. The co-accused namely Suman Kumar Modi has been granted bail considering the fact that the victim has not supported his involvement during investigation which is clearly mentioned in para 83 of the case diary.

7. Hence, in view of the aforesaid serious allegation against the petitioners and the fact that the investigation against the petitioners is still pending, therefore, this court is not inclined to release the petitioners on bail, and accordingly, their prayer for bail is **rejected**.

(Dictated)

(Sandip Singh)
Principal District & Sessions Judge, Jamui.