

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31917 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -73 Year- 2018 Thana -RUPASPUR District- PATNA

=====

1. Ram Babu Singh son of Jaimangal Singh
2. Moti Lal son of late Ramanand Singh
3. Jawahar Lal son of late Ramanand Singh
4. Surendra Singh son of late Ramanand Singh
5. Mosmat Sonamtia Devi wife of late Shiv Prasad Singh
6. Naumi Lal son of late Ramanand Singh
7. Jaimangal Singh son of late Ramanand Singh All residents of village - Chulhichak, Post - Khagaul, P.S. Rupaspur, Dist - Patna.

.... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Satendra Singh, son of Late Kamal Singh, resident of village Chulhaichak, P.S. Rupaspur, District Patna

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rudra Deo
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Rabindra Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 06-09-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Rupaspur P.S.Case No. 73 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation as per FIR is that one Rambachan Singh entered into an agreement for sale of land with complainant and petitioners claim share on the said land as co-sharer and it was decided that petitioners would be made witnesses to the sale deed and for that Rs.30 lakhs was paid to them but neither petitioners were made witnesses nor they returned the amount and for that



legal notices were given to them.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that there is no chit of paper to show that they have been given any amount and the allegation is false and concocted and sale deed was registered by Rambachan Singh in favour of informant.

Heard learned APP and learned counsel for the informant, who has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and in support of his contention he has drawn my attention towards various paragraphs of the case diary to show that money has been taken by the petitioners and even son of petitioner No.2 has admitted so in paragraph-9 of the case diary.

Having heard both sides and in the facts and circumstances, as stated above, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, rather petitioners to surrender and make prayer for regular bail, which shall be considered on its own merit.

With the above observation, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

spa/-

U			
---	--	--	--

