

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22094 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-938 Year-2023 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

=====

Mritunjay Kumar Son of Vijay Pandit Resident of Vidyapati Colony, Behind Patna Museum, Vijay Printing Press, P.S.- Kotwali, District - Patna, at present resident of Block - B, Madhuri Enclave, P.S.- Digha, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vaibhav Bhargava Son of Late Ashok Bhargav Resident of 301, Basanti Mahal Apartment, 43E, Road No. 11F, P.S.- Kadamkuan, Rajendra Nagar, District - Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Prashant Kashyap, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP
	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary
For the Informant :	Mr. SNP Singh, Sr. Advocate
	Mr. SP Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

8 26-03-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned APP for the State, and the learned Senior counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 938 of 2023 registered for the offence under Section(s) 406, 420, 341, 323 and 505 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner is accused of cheating the informant by promising the purchase of shares. The petitioner has remained in custody for more than



one year in connection with the present case.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the informant were having a business relationship and the informant sustained loss in share trading, this false case has been filed.

5. Learned APP for the State and the learned Senior counsel for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail. The learned Senior counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner has disclosed only one antecedent but may have more; therefore, the case may be heard after calling for the antecedent report.

6. I have considered the submissions of the parties and have gone through the records of the case. The petitioner is already on provisional bail, and the parties could not settle their dispute. The petitioner has remained in custody for more than a year in connection with the present case. Moreover, this Court cannot keep the matter pending solely because the informant wishes to verify the petitioner's antecedents.

7. In view of the foregoing discussions, this application is allowed. **Accordingly, the provisional bail, granted to the petitioner by order dated 16.07.2025, is hereby confirmed.** The petitioner shall remain on the same bail



bonds.

8. If the informant has proof of more antecedents, he is given liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

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

