

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38635 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2023 Thana- CHANDAUTI District- Gaya

=====

BHOLA PASWAN @ BHOLA NATH PASWAN S/O BHUNESHWAR
PASWAN @ MUNNA PASWAN R/O Village- Kashma, PS. Chandauti, Dist.
Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Santosh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Suresh Prasad Singh, APP.
	Mr. Sunil Kumar Yadav, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 13-09-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel
for the informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, petitioner is the main accused in the present case, who managed the false registry of the alleged sale deed. Mobile number of the petitioner is also got mentioned in the document of registry.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. Both the parties are neighbours. no such occurrence as alleged



ever took place. He has been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. Petitioner is neither vendor nor vendee of the land in question. He has no role in executing the sale deed as he neither signed nor identified anyone. There is specific allegation against co-accused Rajesh Kumar, who played a vital role in transferring of the alleged land fraudulently. There is no evidence against the petitioner in the FIR except mobile number which may be written by any person. Similarly situated co-accused, namely, Pankaj Kumar, who is witness in the execution of the sale-deed, has been enlarged on bail by a co-ordinate bench of this court vide order dated 23.08.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 50469 of 2023. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant oppose the prayer for bail and submit that petitioner is also involved in the present case.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as the nature of offence, as it is evident from the case diary that the petitioner is also involved in the present case in the alleged sale deed on the basis of forged documents, I am not inclined to



enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail of the
petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

