

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64416 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-217 Year-2017 Thana- AURANGABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Aurangabad

-
1. Manoj Singh @ Manoj Yadav, Son of Late Ramjatan Singh,
 2. Ram Lakhan Singh, Son of Late Ramjatan Singh,
 3. Madan Yadav, Son of Ram Lakhan Yadav,
 4. Binod Yadav, Son of Ram Lakhan Yadav, All four resident of Village- Bara Tola, Jhagar Bigha, P.S.- Obra, Distt- Aurangabad.
 5. Kamlesh Yadav, Son of Suresh Yadav, Resident of Village- Chatara, P.s.- Feshar Distt- Aurangabad Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajmani Devi, W/o Ram Kewal Singh, Resident of Vill- Bela, P.S.- Aurangabad Muffa, Distt- Aurangabad Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjit Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sri Akshay Lal Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

6 07-05-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 217 of 2017, registered under Sections 323, 120B, 420, 467, 468 and 471/34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Aurangabad (Bihar).

The accusation is that Manoj Singh (petitioner no.1) and Ram Lakhan Singh (petitioner no.2), both sons of Late Ramjatan Singh, got executed the sale deed in respect to the land of



complainant, Rajmani Devi placing a fake person on her place and Ram Kewal Singh, husband of the complaint, also put his signature on the sale deed as witness under conspiracy. Later on, Manoj Singh (petitioner no.1) and Ram Lakhan Singh (petitioner no.2) also got mutated their names in the revenue record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, in fact, complainant, who is the wife of Ram Kewal Singh, executed the sale deed in respect to her land, on which, her husband, Ram Kewal Singh, put his signature as witness and petitioner no. 3 also put his signature on sale deed as identifier but with ulterior motive complainant filed Complaint Case No. 217 of 2017 with false allegation.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant-opposite party no.2 opposed the prayer for pre-arrest bail of the petitioner.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the privilege of provisional pre-arrest bail allowed to the petitioner vide order dated 01.02.2019 stands confirmed.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

Bhardwaj/-

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

