

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20845 of 2026

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

=====

Arya Kumar S/o Awadhesh Kumar R/o Mohalla - Haripur Kala, ward no. 8,
P.S.- Harpur, Distt.- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mani Shankar Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State Mr. Rabindra Kumar 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 Dikshit Kumar on 03.04.2025 at 9.30 P.M. had gone to the house of Dilip (father of Dikshit) 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 the mobile of the uncle of the informant 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 head, jaw and hand, further petitioner, Deepak, Dilip and Dikshit 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 accompanied petitioner and Dikshit to the house of Dikshit for sleeping, when the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is also submitted that petitioner like the deceased had gone to the house of Dikshit for party. It is also submitted that had the petitioner been involved in the occurrence in that event efforts would have been made to dispose of the dead body with a view to conceal the evidence or the petitioner would have fled from the place of occurrence but then petitioner was present at the place of occurrence.

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 disputed rather stands admitted is that Sonu died and from perusal of the FIR, it would manifest that Sonu had mark of injuries on head, jaw and hand, which amply demonstrates that he was assaulted. It is further submitted that specific allegation is alleged in the FIR that CCTV of the house of Dilip was tampered which further creates a suspicion that for ulterior reasons, the CCTV was tampered. It is also submitted that had the petitioner, Dikshit and others been not involved in the occurrence, in that event, the CCTV would not have been 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	
---	--	---	--

