

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19015 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-86 Year-2025 Thana- KARPURIGRAM District- Samastipur

Naresh Sahni @ Naresh Chaudhary S/o Hiyalal Sahni R/o Village-
Sambhupatti, Ward No.29, P.S.- Karpoorigram, Dist.- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Praveen, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 31-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Karpoorigram P.S. Case No.86 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 294(2)A, 77, 79, 308(3), 108, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (in short 'BNS') and under Sections 66(E) & 67(A) of the Information Technology (in short 'I.T.') Act.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, is that the informant has received a call from mobile nos. 8587056253 and 9835668482. The caller made a call and said that he is having a photograph of the informant and her husband in compromising position and the same will be made viral if he is not given Rupees Ten Thousand. The caller has disclosed that he has



received the video from one Guddu Kumar.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is father of Guddu Kumar. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that from perusal of the FIR it is clear that there is no allegation against the petitioner. The allegation is against the caller and it has further been submitted that both the numbers from which the call was made to the informant does not belong to the petitioner. It has further been submitted that from perusal of the FIR it is clear that offence is of 08.07.2025; this case has been filed on 16.08.2025. The delay in filing of the FIR is not explained. It has further been submitted that from perusal of the FIR it is clear that there is no role of the petitioner in the said occurrence. He is merely father of Guddu Kumar. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner is an old aged person about 66 years of age and he is in custody since 24.11.2025 having no criminal antecedent.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The above named



petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the court of learned District and Sessions Judge, Samastipur in connection with Karpoorigram P.S. Case No.86 of 2025.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

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

