

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.974 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-537 Year-2022 Thana- AHIYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

=====

BABLOO SINGH @ BABLU SINGH Son of Late Bijali Singh R/v-
Tengaraha, P.S.- Meenapur, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. RADHA MOHAN SINGH Son of Sri Narayan Singh R/v and P.O.-
Chhatauni, P.S.- Tariyani, Dist- Shivhar at present residing at Village-
Shekhpur Sadhu Gachhi Ward No. 6, P.S.- Ahiyapur, Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 01-08-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, State and
informant/opposite party no. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence under Sections 467, 468, 420, 406,
506, 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, an agreement to sale of
land bearing Khata no.15 Khesra no. 275 area 1 katha 10 dhurs
was finalized at the rate of Rs. 14,10,000/- per katha between
him and the petitioners through Babloo Singh (petitioner). After
finalization of same, he paid cash Rs. 6,00,000/- each twice in
presence of Babloo Singh (petitioner). Besides the above, Rs.
11,00,000/- was paid through cheques bearing cheque no.



074960 and 074961 in the account of co-accused Renu Verma. Later both the co-accused i.e. Renu Verma and Sumit Kumar Verma turned their eyes away on the point of execution of sale deed in his favour. It has also been alleged that when he asked them to return his money back, the accused persons gave threat of killing.

4. It is submitted on behalf of petitioner that in the F.I.R. itself, the informant admits that entire money was given to co-accused Renu Verma, some of the money through cheques and some through cash in present of this petitioner and at no point of time, any money was paid to this petitioner. Only allegation against this petitioner is that he introduced the informant with co-accused Renu Verma and Sumit Kumar Verma and save & except this, he has got no concern with the aforesaid transaction.

5. However, learned counsel for the informant vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that petitioner is habitual offender and he has got two criminal antecedent of similar nature. Besides above, process of Section 82 Cr.P.C. has also been initiated against this petitioner, but despite that, petitioner has not appeared before the Court below, which is also apparent from the impugned order.



6. Considering the nature of accusation and conduct
of the petitioner, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay/-

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

