

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43282 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-631 Year-2015 Thana- BUXAR COMPLAINT CASE District-
Buxar

-
1. SAUDAGAR PANDEY SON OF LATE SRIKRISHNA PANDEY
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- CHINI MILL BUXAR, WARD NO. 34, PS-
BUXAR (T), DISTRICT- BUXAR
 2. RAMAN KUMAR MISHRA SON OF LATE SACHIDANAND MISHRA
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- CHINI MILL BUXAR, WARD NO. 34, PS-
BUXAR (T), DISTRICT- BUXAR

... .. Petitioners.

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. UDAY SINGH @ UDAY PRATAP SINGH SON OF LATE YADU SINGH
RESIDENT OF VILLAGE- BHADAR, PS- SIKRAUL, DISTRICT-
BUXAR

... .. Opposite Partys.

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramakant Yadav, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Surendra Kumar, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

6 08-05-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the

learned A.P.P. for the State assisted by learned counsel for the

opposite party no.2.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No.631 (C) of 20215 for the
offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467 and 468 of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. The petitioners, who are said to be brokers of
land, got executed a sale deed from accused Hareram Pandey in
favour of complainant's wife Nirmala Devi but neither the land



was registered in her favour nor the money was returned.

4. The petitioners are quite innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case due to previous grudge. Nothing has happened in the manner as alleged by the complainant. The allegations levelled against the petitioners is general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner no.1 has 11 criminal antecedents, whereas petitioner no.2 has one criminal antecedents and all are for similar nature of the offence.

5. Per contra, learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioners is serious in nature, hence they do not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case and the criminal antecedents of the petitioners, I am not inclined to enlarge them on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected. However, if the petitioners surrender before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail the learned Court below would pass order in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

