

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.76293 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-235 Year-2025 Thana- VAISHALI District- Vaishali

Sarvesh Kumar @ Meghu Kumar S/O Jagdish Bhagat R/O village - Karneji,
P.S. - Belsur, District – Vaishali Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-01-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Vaishali P.S. Case no.235 of 2025, registered under sections 191(2), 190, 126(2), 115(2), 325, 326(g), 324(4), 74, 352 and 351(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the petitioner along with one another entered the place where the function of wedding reception of his nephew was taking place and started insisting that they play a song of his choice. They were wielding pistol. It is further stated that on protest, they went away, however they lighted up the house by sprinkling petrol, thus causing loss of over a lakh rupees.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. No such occurrence as alleged in the FIR has taken place. No



incriminating article has been recovered from the petitioner. The informant is not an eye witness to the occurrence and the allegations are general and omnibus in nature. The petitioner is in custody since 2.6.2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case. Further referring to the statement made in paragraph nos. 12 and 13 of the petition, learned counsel submits that the cause of false implication is the earlier dispute between the parties as described therein.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State, who submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner in the FIR and the allegation of the petitioner having set the house on fire is supported by the witnesses in course of investigation.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the FIR together with the material that has transpired in course of investigation, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after six months.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Shiv/-

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

