

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-699 Year-2022 Thana- MUNGER COMPLAINT CASE
District- Munger

2. CHHOTU KUMAR SON OF MAHENDRA TANTI RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- SANGRAMPUR, PS- SANGRAMPUR, DISTT- MUNGER

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. RAM NANDAN KUMAR SON OF JAGDISH TANTI RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- SANGRAMPUR PS- SANGRAMPUR, DISTT- MUNGER

... .. Opposite Party/s

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nakul Kumar Jamuar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Zainul Abedin, A.P.P.



criminal colour has been given. It is further submitted that the sale deed in respect of the land in question was executed in favour of the complainant/opposite party no. 2 by Mahendra Tanti. It is next submitted that said Mahendra Tanti is father of Chhotu Kumar (petitioner no. 2). It is also submitted that the sale deed was executed in the year 2017 and the present complaint case came to be instituted in the year 2022 which amply demonstrates that for some ulterior reason, the complaint case has been instituted with an allegation that the land which was executed by Mahendra Tanti does not exist. It is thus submitted that if the land did not exist when the sale deed was executed nothing prevented the complainant/opposite party no. 2 from approaching the police or the Court in time but the fact that complaint case came to be instituted five years after the execution of the sale deed casts an aspersion on the case of the complainant/opposite party no. 2. It is further submitted that the complainant/opposite party no. 2 is only trying to pressurize the accused persons including the petitioner no. 2 to sell his land which is near the land which has been purchased by the complainant/opposite party no. 2. It is next submitted that if what has been alleged in the complaint case is true in that event the petitioner no. 2 has remedy before the Court of competent



civil jurisdiction.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant/opposite party no. 2 opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner no. 2 but are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner no. 2 that the complaint case came to be instituted five years after execution of the sale deed.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner no. 2, the petitioner no. 2 above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below 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 court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No. 699C of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

