

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55394 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-205 Year-2020 Thana- KAJI MUHAMMADPUR District-
Muzaffarpur

=====

Vaibhav Mishra S/O Mukesh Mishra Resident of Rahul Nagar, P.S.-
Brahmpura, Dist.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Renuka Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Rajni Kant Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Priya Sharan Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-11-2025 1. Heard Ms. Renuka Sharma, learned counsel for the
petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. A prayer for bail has been made on behalf of the
petitioner in connection with Kaji Muhammadpur P.S. Case no.205
of 2020 registered under sections 467, 468, 420, 471, 354(a),
354(b), 354(c) and 354(d) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation in the F.I.R is that the petitioner along
with two others intercepted the informant and had taken some
obscene photographs of the informant and was threatening to make
it viral. It is further alleged that the petitioner also got her
signatures on blank papers and the petitioner along with his friend
Abhijit Mishra, had created a Facebook account in her name for
causing her character assassination.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated by the present informant on
account of some earlier dispute. As a matter of fact the informant
had earlier also filed a case against the petitioner bearing



Kajimohammadpur P.S. Case No. 274 of 2019 with similar allegations which was found false along with another case filed by the informant's friend being Mithanpura P.S. Case No. 54 of 2019 against the petitioner which was also found false. It has further been contended that the entire allegation of making objectionable photographs viral on Facebook has no legs to stand as even during course of investigation the said allegation is not substantiated and the present case was neither lodged against provisions of the I.T Act nor any charge-sheet has been submitted under the said Act. The petitioner is in custody since 06.04.2025 and undertakes to co-operate in the case/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State on the ground that there are serious allegation levelled against this petitioner as also petitioner has fifteen criminal antecedents. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that two out of the cases enumerated have already been found false while the petitioner is on bail in other cases.

6. Taking into consideration the above mentioned facts of the case and also considering the fact that the allegations of making the photographs of the informant viral does not get substantiated by the material collected during course of investigation coupled with the fact that the earlier case filed by the informant was also found false and petitioner is in custody



since 06.04.2025, the petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail in connection with Kaji Muhammadpur P.S. Case no.205 of 2020 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned concerned Court where the case is pending/Successor Court, subject to the following conditions:-

(I) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be the family member/close relative of the petitioner.

(II) He shall co-operate in the trial and would make himself available on each and every date fixed by the trial Court and in case of non-appearance on any date without any sufficient reason, the learned trial Court is at liberty to cancel the bail bonds.

(III) The petitioner would not indulge in any similar kind of offence and also not tampering with evidence.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

