

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.18417 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -3510 Year- 2017 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
PATNA

=====

Adarsh Kumar @ Adarsh Kumar Pandey, son of Chintamani Pandey,
resident of Flat No. C-113, Rajnigandha Apartment, Kurjee, PS Patliputra
District Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State of Bihar
2. Anju Kumari, daughter of Jwala Prasad Singh, wife of Shashi Bhushand, resident of Mohalla Postal Park, PS Jakkanpur, District Patna, present address Alkapuri, Sandalpar, PS Bahadurpur, District Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Dhanendra Chaubey
For the Opposite Party : Mr. Sri Anand Kishore Choudhary
For the Complainant : Mr. Dinu Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 30-03-2018 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and the State as also
the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

Petitioner, already in custody seeks bail in Complaint Case
No. 3510 (C) of 2017 registered under Sections 323, 354, 379, 419,
420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 504, 506, 34 and 120B of the IPC.

The allegation in brief is that the complainant was
approached by the accused persons and proposal was given to
purchase a piece of land and eighty-two lakh rupees was taken by the
accused persons mainly Veermani Kumar Singh after entering into
an agreement for sale, the petitioner is said to have given all
mutation papers with respect to that land but later on it was found
that the land owner was Harendra Kumar Dutta and he had not
executed any agreement for sale in favour of Veermani Kumar
Singh, all the accused persons conspired together, cheated the
complainant and siphoned eighty-two lakh rupees from the petitioner
and they also issued two cheques of ten lakh rupees each in favour of
the complainant in order to return back the money but it was



bounced.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that there was agreement for sale in between Veermani Kumar Singh and the complainant and part of the consideration money was given to Veermani Kumar Singh also and not to the petitioner.

Whereas, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that all the accused persons hatched up a conspiracy, this petitioner initiated the negotiation, shown land proposed to be sold and also handed over forged mutation papers after execution of sale deed and after exposure of fraud in order to return back money he issued two cheques each of ten lakhs rupees which got bounced.

Having considered the aforesaid facts, circumstances and the nature of the offence the court is not persuaded to grant bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly the prayer for bail on behalf of the petitioner is rejected.

The trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Arun Kumar, J)

Snkumar/-

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

