

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60571 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2024 Thana- BEERPUR District- Begusarai

1. Sabita Devi W/o- Bindeshwari Mahto Village- Nonepur Ps- Teghra Dist- Begusarai
2. Dinesh Kumar S/o- Arun kumar Singh @ Arun kumar Village- Gara Ps- Bhagwanpur Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                         |
|--------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Shubhesh Pandey     |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Ajit Kumar          |
| For the Complainant      | : | Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      30-09-2024                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 417, 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 504, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a purely civil dispute has been given a criminal colour. It is also submitted that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the petitioner no.1 is a woman. It is next submitted that complainant (Govind) was married to Ruma Devi and out of the



wedlock, he had three children, namely Mamta, Samta and Bipin. It is next submitted that informant in the F.I.R. though accepts that he was married to Ruma but then alleges that he had only two daughters namely Mamta and Samta and concealed the fact that he has a son namely Bipin. It is next submitted that petitioner no.1 purchased the land in question from Bipin by a sale deed executed in the year 2019 and thereafter in the year 2023 petitioner no.1 sold the said land to Raja by a registered sale deed dated 20.12.2023, on which, petitioner no.2 is a witness.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners and submits that no doubt the sale deed of the year 2019 is alleged to have been executed by Bipin but then it is submitted that someone else impersonated Bipin and executed the sale deed with an intention to grab the land of the complainant, on which, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that how such submission could have been made when in the F.I.R. the complainant does not even remotely suggest that he had a son also named Bipin. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner further submits that if the



complainant is aggrieved by the fact that the sale deed in favour of Sabita Devi was executed by an impersonator in the year 2019, he has remedy of approaching a court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed cancelled.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their 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) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No.392/2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

