

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25960 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-329 Year-2020 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna

1. SANGEETA SINGH Wife of Anil Kumar Singh R/o Mohalla - Abhiyanta Nagar, Near Ramnagri More, P.S. - Rajiv Nagar, District - Patna.
2. Vinayak Raj Son of Anil Kumar Singh R/o Mohalla - Abhiyanta Nagar, Near Ramnagri More, P.S. - Rajiv Nagar, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Madhukar Anand, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-06-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 406, 504 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 1 is a woman. It is further submitted that petitioner no. 1 is wife of Anil Kumar Singh and petitioner no. 2 is son of Anil Kumar Singh.

The informant alleges that Anil Kumar Singh had taken a loan of Rs.84 lakhs from the informant but the said loan was not in the knowledge of the petitioners nor any document



was signed by the petitioners which could even remotely suggest that they were aware that Anil Kumar Singh has taken a loan. It is further alleged that petitioners came to be implicated on the ground that petitioner no. 2 had sent a threatening Whatsapp message to the informant and the petitioner no. 1 came to his office and threatened him.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that from perusal of the Whatsapp message which is annexed as Annexure-3 to the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that the same does not even remotely suggest that it was a threatening message and as far as petitioner no. 1 is concerned the allegations against her are ornamental. It is further submitted that later the petitioners came to know about the amount being taken by Anil Kumar Singh as is being alleged by the informant in the FIR. It is next submitted that though the informant alleges that he had given Rs.84 lakhs as loan to Anil Kumar Singh but the amount paid was only Rs.67 lakhs and the same was by way of cheque. It is also submitted that the dispute is purely civil in nature and the present criminal case has been instituted only to coerce the petitioners into submission so that a compromise is arrived at.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for



the informant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners. Learned counsel for the informant submits that an amount of Rs.4 lakhs was credited in the account of the petitioner no. 1. The said submission is rebutted by the learned counsel for the petitioners and it is submitted that it has been specifically pleaded at para 15 of the anticipatory bail application that the account was a joint account and as such petitioner no. 1 was completely unaware that an amount of Rs.4 lakhs has been credited.

Be that as it may, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Sri Krishnapuri P.S. Case No. 329 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

