

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17931 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-575 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Munna Kumar S/o Late Sukhdeo Prasad Yadav R/o Ranipur Kali Asthan, P.S.
- Mehndiganj, Dist. - Patna, State - Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Lalji Paswan S/o Late Baijnath Paswan R/o Hasanpur Par Nandi, P.S. - Beur,
Dist. - Patna, State - Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-04-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No.575(C) of 2023 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 420, and 504 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the
informant and a purely civil dispute has been given a criminal
colour. It is also submitted that even presuming what has been
alleged is true without admitting then from the perusal of
allegation as alleged in the complaint, it would manifest that the



complainant alleges that a sum of Rs. 1.35 lakh (one lakh and thirty five thousand) was given to the petitioner when the rest of the amount was given to other accused persons by cheque in their account. It is further submitted that complainant alleges that he has been duped of his hard earned money of Rs. 38 lakhs by the accused persons in connivance. It is further submitted that the land, which the complainant intended to purchase, does not belong to the petitioner rather the land belongs to his brother-in-law and the mother of his brother-in-law; and the petitioner in no way was concerned with the land in question, but being a relative, he had taken the said amount for paying to his brother-in-law. It is next submitted that petitioner is even ready to repay Rs. 1.35 lakh, which is alleged to have been taken by him.

4. The learned APP submits that it appears that all the accused persons in connivance duped the complainant of his hard earned money. It is next submitted that no doubt the petitioner is taking a stand that he is willing to repay the amount which he had taken, but then submits that his bonafide would have been established, had he returned the amount prior to institution of the instant complaint case.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned



APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the present anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

