

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17706 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-614 Year-2025 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

1. Mukesh Goswami Son of Dayanand Goswami Resident of Village- Suggi, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui
2. Pawan Goswami Son of Dayanand Goswami Resident of Village- Suggi, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui
3. Mankhush Goswami Son of Mukesh Goswami Resident of Village- Suggi, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Narendra Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 25-03-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Jamui P.S. Case No.614 of 2025, F.I.R dated 08.11.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 15(2), 352, 109, 118(1), 303(2), 3(5), 117(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. According to prosecution case, on 07.11.2025 at about 7:30 P.M., while she was sitting in her house, the accused persons suddenly arrived and started abusing her. Upon protest, Mukesh Goswami and Pawan Goswami, armed with swords and



allegedly acting at the instigation of Dayanand Goswami, assaulted Lalu Goswami and Kanhaiya Goswami with an intention to kill, causing head injuries to both. It is further alleged that Mankhush Yadav pushed Kanhaiya Goswami to the ground and snatched Rs.25,000/- in cash and a gold chain. When the informant objected, Mankhush Goswami allegedly assaulted her with an iron rod with intent to kill, causing injury to her hand resulting in fracture. Rinku Devi and Komal Devi also allegedly assaulted the informant by pulling her hair and beating her.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the nature of injuries sustained by the informant does not corroborate the nature of allegations levelled in the F.I.R. as the injuries have been sustained on his arm and wrist and with regard to other persons, the injuries have been found to be simple in nature and there is no specific allegation of any overt act levelled against the petitioner rather the allegations are general and omnibus in nature. It has next been submitted that the one co-accused person, namely, Dayanand was already taken into judicial custody and is on bail. Lastly, it has been submitted that petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 have no criminal antecedent while petitioner No.3 has one criminal antecedent in which he is on bail.



5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the injuries sustained by the injured persons are simple in nature and with regard to the informant, the injuries does not corroborate the allegations levelled in the F.I.R. and petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 have no criminal antecedent while petitioner No.3 has one criminal antecedent in which he is on bail. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jamui, in connection with Jamui P.S. Case No.614 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide



official document/personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

