

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33959 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-111 Year-2021 Thana- DEHRI TOWN District- Rohtas

=====

MURALIDHAR SINGH @ MURARI SINGH S/o Ramdev Singh Resident
of Village - Dahaur Tola (karkhana), P.S.- Dehri (Muffasil), District - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. K.P. Singh (Sr. Adv.)

Mr. Bhaskar Shankar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anand Mohan Prasad Mehta

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 02-02-2023 Heard Ld. counsel for the petitioner and Ld. APP
for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Dehri
(Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 111 of 2021, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 448,
504, 506, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case as emerging from the FIR is
that three forged sale-deeds have been executed as per



which purportedly, the informant Vimla Devi has sold her property in favour of the purchasers, namely, Kr. Mritunjay, Raj Kumar and Rajesh Kumar, whereas the fact is that she has never sold the property and her signature has been forged in the sale-deed and the present accused-petitioner, namely, Murlidhar Singh and Promod Singh have signed on the sale-deed as identifiers of the parties to the sale-deeds.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that accused Pramod Singh is brother of the informant Vimla Devi and he had put his signature on the sale-deeds as identifier and on his asking, the petitioner had put his signature on the sale-deeds. He further submits that whether the informant has sold the property or not or whether her signature has been forged in the sale-deed is matter of inquiry by Court of competent jurisdiction and only after finding her signature forged any case will be made out. He also submits that investigation in this case is complete and charge-sheet has already been submitted.



He further submits that the petitioner has been languishing in jail since 11.03.2022.

It has also been stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one.

However, Ld. APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, **this application is allowed**, directing the petitioner, above-named, to be enlarged on bail on his furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000 /- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Ld. J.M. 1st Class, Dehri-on-sone, Rohtas in connection with Dehri (Muffasil) P.S. Case No. 111 of 2021, on the following conditions:

(i) The petitioner will make himself available for interrogation by a police officer/court as and when required.

(ii) The petitioner will undertake that



investigation/trial will not hamper on account of his absence or non-cooperation. He must be available to the police or the court whenever his presence is required.

(iii) The petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer.

(iv) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that the petitioner has any criminal antecedents, Ld. court below shall cancel the bail bond of the petitioner after hearing him and getting satisfied that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents despite his knowledge of the same.

(v) In case, it is brought to the notice of the court below that statement regarding previous bail petition is wrong, Ld. court below shall cancel the bail bond of the petitioner.

Ld. counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove all the defects, if any, pointed out by the office within a



period of one month and the Registry is directed to issue the
certified copy of this order only after removal of office
objections.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

ashishkr/-

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

