

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.62693 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -257 Year- 2017 Thana -JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE District-
JEHANABAD

- =====
1. Vijay Sharma, son of Late Rajeshwar Sharma
 2. Arun Sharma, son of Late Rajeshwar Sharma
 3. Suresh Singh, son of Late Jairam Singh
 4. Ramjanam Paswan, son of Late Nanhak Paswan
 5. Lavkush Kumar, son of Late Fateh Ram
 6. Lal Babu Kumar, son of Late Fateh Ram
 7. Raj Kumar Ram @ Raj Kumar son of Late Chechan Ram
 8. Sushil Paswan, son of Late Nanhak Paswan
 9. Ram Adhodya Paswan, son of Late Nanhak Paswan
 10. Umesh Ram, son of Late Gopi Ram

All resident of village-Tejpura, P.S. Rampur, Choram, District-Arwal

11. Mukesh Kumar, son of Late Devlal Singh, resident of village-
Sukhibigha, P.S. Rampur, Choram, District-Arwal
12. Munna Kumar, son of Girjaram Chandravansi, resident of village-
Tejpura, P.S. Rampur Choram, District-Arwal
13. Rajendra Singh, son of Late Ambika Singh, resident of village-
Kashopur, P.S. Arwal, District-Arwal
14. Ramashray Singh, son of Late Jairam Singh, resident of village-Tejpura,
P.S. Rampur, Choram, District-Arwal

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajendra Singh, S/o Late Jagdish Singh, R/o village- Tejpura, P.S.
Rampur Chauram, District-Arwal

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance:

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ansarul Haque, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MOHIT KUMAR SHAH
ORAL ORDER

2 05-01-2018 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the
learned APP for the State.

This is an application for grant of anticipatory bail in
connection with Complaint Case No. 257 of 2017 registered for
the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 323 and



504/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation is regarding some of the accused persons conspiring together and selling of the land of the complainant to the other co-accused persons.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation levelled in the present case constitutes a dispute of a civil nature and the proper remedy for the complainant is to approach the competent court of civil jurisdiction. It is further submitted that the petitioners have a clean antecedent.

The learned counsel for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submits that none of the petitioners are having a clean antecedent.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case more particularly the fact that the allegation levelled in the present case constitute, at best, a civil dispute, I direct for enlarging the petitioners above named on anticipatory bail after verification of their antecedent and in case it is found that any of the petitioners is having criminal antecedent, such petitioners would not be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, I direct for enlarging the petitioners above named in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from the date of



receipt/production of a copy of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (rupees ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Arwal in connection with Complaint Case No. 257 of 2017 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Mohit Kumar Shah, J)

S.Sb/-

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

