

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80078 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-331 Year-2025 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

Mukesh Sharma Son of Sri Chhotan Sharma R/v-New Atwarpur, Kurthaul P.S-
Parsa Bazar Distt-Patna, At Present Amrudi Bagicha, P.S-Digha Distt-Patna
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar Sinha, Adv
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pranav Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 08-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 331 of 2025 dated 16.05.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 308(4), 329(3), 352, 351(2) read with Section 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant has given construction work of Market Complex, to S.S. Construction. On 13.05.2025, an unknown person came and asked for the informant's mobile number from the Supervisor, namely, Raushan Kumar, and told him to speak on the phone with a person who identified himself as Bhim alias Shatrudhan who threatened to stop the construction and warned of dire consequences if the work continued. On 15.05.2025, five



unknown men including Bhim came to the informant's residence and threatened his father-in-law (a retired army officer) demanding Rs. 50,00,000/- as extortion money otherwise they would kill the entire family.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. It is submitted that the petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. His name has surfaced in the present case only on the basis of the confessional statement of the co-accused Satrudhan Kumar @ Bhim which has got no evidentiary value in the eyes of law. It is further submitted that the co-accused Satrudhan Kumar @ Bhim in his confessional statement named the petitioner as his companion but he clearly stated that on 13.05.2025, one Ramjee and Raja Pandit went to the place of occurrence at the instance of Binod Kumar and one Raja Pandit has given the telephone number to the Supervisor on such, he directed him to stop the work and thereafter on 15.05.2025, Satrudhan Kumar @ Bhim, Ramjee, Lalu Kumar, Raja Pandit and Mukesh Kumar went to the house of the plot's owner Md. Imran Ali at Rahmat Compound and demanded ransom of Rs. 50,00,000/- and if their demand would not be fulfilled then they would give him a license but he has not disclosed the name of



the petitioner in the alleged occurrence. It further revealed that on 20.05.2025, when Satrudhan Kumar @ Bhim came to know that the construction work was going on, on the same plot then he went to the said plot with Pankaj Kumar, Binod Kumar @ Biliati through four wheeler for stopping the work but after seeing the police vehicle, he tried to flee away but he was arrested by the police when no construction work was going on, on 20.05.2025. Similarly situated co-accused person has already been granted bail this Court vide order dated 13.10.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. 66971 of 2025. The petitioner has four criminal antecedents in which he is on bail as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition. He is in custody in this case since 27.05.2025.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the bail petition of the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the period of custody, the petitioner, above named, is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Court concerned, Patna in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 331 of 2025 with a condition:-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned Court below



on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bond of the petitioner is liable to be cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Jyoti/-

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

