

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24624 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1605 Year-1999 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Sudhir Kumar Singh S/o Sewi Prasad Singh Secretary, Krishna Sahkari Grih
Nirman Samiti Ltd., Patna, 267 Rajbansi Nagar, R/o Bashundhara Apartment,
608 Ashiana Digha Road, P.S. - Shastrinagar, Distt. - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smt. Shanti Devi W/o Sri Ramjeet Singh R/o Mohalla - Sheikhpura, P.S. -
Shastrinagar, Distt. - patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Avinash, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 01-05-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the

complainant as also the learned APP, Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in

connection with Complaint Case No. 1605(C) of 1999 instituted

under Sections 419, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of the Indian Penal

Code filed on 20.1.2000 by the informant, Shanti Devi.

3. The prosecution story comes out of Complaint Case

No. 1605(C) of 1999 and the year itself reflects that the

anticipatory bail application has been preferred after 25 years.

As per the complaint, she alongwith her husband had served

Lachiya Devi who gifted her properties through a registered gift

on 16.7.1984 at Calcutta (now Kolkata). However, out of anger,



the accused persons hatched conspiracy by putting up fictitious person as Lachiya Devi got another deed of gift on 17.10.1984 in which other accused persons became identifier/witness. Thereafter, this petitioner informed the complainant that he has purchased the land from the accused 1 and 2. Upon knowledge of the conspiracy, the Complainant.

4. Though, the learned counsel for the petitioner tried to impress upon this Court that the bail were granted to the other accused persons in the year 2001. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that they were granted bail not anticipatory bail that too in the year 2001. The petitioner waited for 24 years to seek anticipatory bail.

5. In that background, it would be appropriate that the petitioner seek bail after surrendering before the concerned Court.

6. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

