

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.42454 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2017 Thana- BHAGALPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Bhagalpur

=====

NEPALI YADAV S/o Budho Yadav R/o village- Jamuniya, P.S.- Parbatta,
District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sahdev Tatma S/o Late Chain Tatma Resident of Tulsipur, P.S.- Kharik,
Present Residing at Sadhopur, P.S.- Rangra, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjan Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 12-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 466, 468, 471, 161 and 166 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that his wife had filed Case No. 16 of 2012 against the petitioner in which the D.C.L.R. had directed the Circle Officer and Officer-in-charge to ensure possession of the land in question is handed over to her, but when no action was taken, his wife complained to the D.M but from at the level of the D.M



also no action was taken, thereafter, she moved before the State Information Commissioner, where the Circle Officer gave wrong information based on a forged document as detailed in the complaint, thereafter when matter was taken up by the State Information Commissioner, the case was disposed of with a direction to his wife to take any action in accordance with law in pursuance whereof the present F.I.R. has been instituted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the information was provided by the petitioner based on documentary evidence, it is the allegation of the informant that the information was based on forged and fabricated documentary evidence but then that is a matter of trial.

Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount



each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No. 232 of 2017 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

