

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74526 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1268 Year-2021 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

RAVI NANDAN @ RAVINANDAN SINHA Son of Late Uma Shankar
Sinha Rtd. Income tax Officer, Resident of Maheshwar Kutir beside Sanskrit
Mahaviyalaya Road No. 4, Kazipur, P.S- Kadam Kuan, Dist- Patna (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ranjan Kumar Son of Late Chitralal Singh Proprietor of Guru Construction,
R/o Chiraiyatar, Devi Asthan, third floor, P.S- Jakkanpur, Dist- and Patna
800001

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Priyanka Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Md. Mushtaque Alam, APP.
	Mr. Dineshwar Tiwary, Adv.
	Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 27-06-2023 Heard the parties.

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

Allegedly, petitioner along with other co-accused persons,
is said to have sold the land to the complainant assuring him that
the land is free from all encumbrances, defects and debts.
Petitioner acted as a mediator for finalization of the agreement
with the help of co-accused Rajiv Kumar. Co-accused Rajiv
Kumar, Commissioner of Income Tax gave assurance to the



complainant about the land but the said land was found to be mortgaged with Bank of Baroda.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. 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 not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner is neither the owner nor purchaser of the said land. From perusal of record, it is transpired that an agreement was made between the complainant and accused nos. 1 to 12, however, the petitioner was not made party to the same. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the petitioner along with other accused persons, took the complainant in their confidence and committed cheating with him for Rs. 1,01,00,000/-.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case considering the argument of the parties, as there is civil dispute between the parties and petitioner is only a witness in the said agreement, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail,



in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) 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 Complaint Case No. 1268(C) of 2021, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

It is made clear that the present order will not come in aid of the other co-accused for availing benefit of bail.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

