

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.17847 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -904 Year- 2016 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
PATNA

=====

1. Ranjeet Kumar Son of Sri Ram Pravesh Rai Resident of Village- Jathua,
P.S. Town Hajipur, District- Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sunita Verma W/o late Jitendra Nath R/o-115, Hope Chandra Apartment,
Nehru Nagar, P.S. Patliputra District- Patna.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Samrendra Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Ajit Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 26-04-2018 Heard the parties.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No.904(C) of 2016 registered for offences
punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120(B) of the Indian
Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner is that the complainant was
in need of the land for construction of house and as such he was
approached by the accused persons for providing the land and
initially Rs.2,50,000/- was given as advance money and thereafter
seven sale deeds were executed with respect to transaction more
than Rs.03 crore but later on the complainant made complaint to
him that the land does not belong to the persons who have sold the



land and petitioner is named in the complaint petition.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is not the person who has sold the land rather it can not be said that he is broker and furthermore it is submitted that another co-accused has been granted privilege of the anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this court, vide order dated 9.11.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No.49733 of 2017.

Heard learned counsel for the A.P.P. and the informant. They have opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the person who has been given privilege of anticipatory bail is only introducer whereas the petitioner is the instrumental in the whole story and the land does not belong to him and the litigation was held between them. He is not returning the money and prayed before this Court for anticipatory bail.

Having heard both sides and in view of the facts and circumstances, as stated above, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as such the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

chn/-

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

