

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15584 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2577 Year-2022 Thana- WEST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- West Champaran

=====

Hanuman Gauro @ Hunuman Gaurav Son of Late Bhimal Gauro @ Bhim
Gaurav R/o Village - Harkatwa, P.S.- Gaunaha, District- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Jokhan Mahto Son of Late Bihar Mahto R/o Village - Pipradhi, P.S.-
Gaunaha, District- West Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Kumar Gupta

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 02-07-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 420,
467, 468, 471, 406, 323, 147, 148 and 384 of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and has been falsely
implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next
submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the
FIR, it would manifest that the dispute is purely civil to which a
criminal colour has been given and the informant alleges that he



had purchased land in question from one Abdul Nasir in the year 2007 by way of a sale-deed for a consideration of Rs. 1 lakh 13 thousand on which the petitioner was an identifier, but when the complainant went to take possession of the land, the same was objected by the relatives of Abdul Nasir on which he requested Abdul Nasir to ensure that he gets his possession over the land on which the Abdul Nasir asked the complainant to take possession and when the complainant went to take possession of the land in question, Abdul Nasir along with other accused persons including petitioner assaulted him. The learned counsel further submits that the sale deed was executed in the year 2007 and the instant complaint case came to be filed in the year 2022, i.e., after a delay of more than 14 years, which amply demonstrates that the case has been instituted for some ulterior reasons.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-



(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No. 2577C of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

