

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-100 Year-2025 Thana- BELDOUR District- Khagaria

Dikshit Kumar @ Dikshit Kumar Roy S/o Dilip Singh @ Dilip Kumar Singh
R/o Mohalla - ward no. 5, P.s.- Beldaur, Distt.- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mani Shankar Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Yogendra Kumar Singh, APP
For the informant	:	Mr. Aditya Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Beldaur P.S. Case No.100 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in custody since 03.11.2025 and the informant alleges that his brother Sonu along with petitioner and Arya on 03.04.2025 at 9.30 P.M. had gone to the house of Dilip (father of petitioner) at Tilathi crossing for sleeping, further on 04.04.2025 at 6.54 A.M. another son of Dilip, namely, Deepak made a call on mobile of his uncle informing that Sonu died, accordingly, informant



along with others reached the place of occurrence and saw the dead body of Sonu lying in a ditch with mark of injuries on jaw and hand, further petitioner, Deepak, Dilip and Arya were present at the place of occurrence and on verifying the CCTV installed in the house, it appeared that the same was tampered with, accordingly the police was informed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that Sonu had gone to the house of the petitioner along with friends for sleeping and it was Deepak, brother of the petitioner, who informed the uncle of the informant that Sonu has died. It is further submitted that had the petitioner or his family members been involved in the occurrence then efforts would have been made to conceal the evidence by disposing of the dead body but then the same was not done as neither petitioner nor his family members were involved in the occurrence. It is also submitted that FIR does not even remotely suggest any motive for the occurrence. It is also submitted that petitioner and deceased were good friend, as such there appears no reason that why petitioner along with others



would have killed the deceased.

5. Learned A.P.P. and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that what is not in dispute rather stands admitted is that Sonu died and his dead body was lying in a ditch with mark of injuries as recorded hereinabove. It is further submitted that informant specifically alleges that the CCTV installed in the premise was tampered with, which amply suggests that the occurrence might have been committed by the accused persons hence the CCTV was tampered.

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

7. The bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

