

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60602 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-85 Year-2022 Thana- SARAI RANJAN District- Samastipur

1. RABI KUMAR THAKUR S/o Ram Brichh Thakur Resident of village-Tiswara, P.S.- Tajpur, District- Samastipur
2. RUBI KUMARI THAKUR W/o Rabi Kumar Thakur Resident of village-Tiswara, P.S.- Tajpur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioners.

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ghanshyam Choudhary
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Atul Chandra
For the Informant	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar-1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 25-07-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Sariranjana P.S. Case No.85 of 2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 504, 506 & 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that informant has talked to sale her land at the rate of 13,00,00/- per katha with petitioner Sachin Ranjan and he has given Rs.40,000/- as advance to the informant and told that after execution of sale deed rest amount will be paid and the informant executed sale



deed of 15 dhurs but the petitioners did not pay the rest consideration amount.

4. The petitioners are quite innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case due to previous grudge. It is further submitted that as a matter of fact, petitioners have given Rs.3,00,000/- to the informant before the registration of the aforesaid land and the same was accepted before the Registrar. After registration, the informant, under influence of local people, wants higher amount and due to this reason, this false and frivolous case has been lodged against the petitioners and others. The allegations levelled against the petitioners is general and omnibus in nature. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Per contra, learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that considering the allegations levelled against the petitioners, they do not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as the nature of the allegation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected. However, if the petitioners surrender before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek



regular bail the learned Court below would pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

