

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10244 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2025 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

=====

Sonal Kumar Sharma @ Sonal Sharma @ Sonal Kumar S/o Ranjeet Sharma  
Resident of village- Morwa Rai Tole, Police Station- Musarigharari, District  
Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |                       |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr.Pramod Kumar Singh |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr.Md. Mushtaque Alam |
|                            | Mr.Rajesh Kumar       |
|                            | Mr.Rakesh Kumar Jha   |
|                            | Mr.Navin Kumar        |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      04-05-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned  
  
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of  
  
the informant.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in Tajpur P. S. Case  
No.134 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under  
Sections 126(2), 308(4), 324(5), 352, 351, 3(5) of the B.N.S.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner is in custody since 08.12.2025 and has antecedent  
of six cases. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the  
petitioner submits that the instant FIR has been instituted with  
respect to offences offences which carries punishment of seven  
years and less. It is next submitted that petitioner had earlier



moved this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.74496 of 2025 and the same was permitted to be withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to file a petition before the concerned Superintendent of Police/ Investigating Officer under Section 35(3) B.N.S.S. by an order dated 19.11.2025. It is submitted that before the petitioner could have filed the petition under Section 35(3) BNSS, he came to be arrested in a different case and thereafter was remanded in the instant case on 08.12.2025.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegations as alleged in the F.I.R., it would manifest that informant alleges that on 10.08.2025, while he was returning from Tajpur when petitioner and Sumit intercepted him and demanded five percent extortion in all schemes on gun point and threatened to kill him if demand is not made. Further, on 12.08.2025, the informant received threatening call from the accused at night and on the same night the petitioner and Sumit came to his house and abused him and asked the informant to come out of the house and when he did not come out they vandalized his vehicle and fled away.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner reiterates and submits that the offences for which the instant FIR has been



instituted carries punishment of seven years and less. It is also submitted that allegation is of demanding extortion but then no extortion was paid. It is next submitted that petitioner has six cases but then the case has been instituted by different persons at the instance of the informant who is the Mukhiya.

6. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the bail application. The learned A.P.P. submits that petitioner has antecedent of six cases and if privilege of regular bail is granted the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

8. The prayer of the petitioner for regular bail stands rejected.

9. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

10. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that Sumit Kumar Sharma has been granted the privilege of regular bail by order dated 19.11.2025 in Cr. Misc. No.73524 of 2025 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that Sumit has antecedent of one



case only whereas petitioner has antecedent of six cases.

**(Satyavrat Verma, J)**

vikash/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

