

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64959 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2202 Year-2020 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

-
1. Kameshwar Rai Son of Late Jagan Rai R/o of village- Gaurichak, P.S-
Gaurichak, Dist- Patna
 2. Lala Rai S/o Kameshwar Rai Resident of Village- Gaurichak, P.S-
Gaurichak, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Ajeet Kumar Pandey S/o Late Parmeshwar Pandey Resident of Locality-
Dujra Pahalwan Ghat, Gate no- 13, P.S- Buddha Colony, Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Ravi Ranjan Mallick
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Satyendra Narayan Singh
For the O.P. No. 02	:	Mrs. Shama Sinha
		Mr. Ravish Kumar Mishra

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-09-2024 Heard the parties.

This application has been filed on behalf of the
petitioners for quashing the order taking cognizance of
Complaint Case No. 2202 C of 2020.

3. The case, in brief, is that the complainant claims
himself to be the owner of 09 decimal of land, appertaining to
khata no. 83, plot no. 111 in Dujra, Buddha Colony, Patna. He
was residing over there with his family. The accused persons,
including the petitioners, after trespassing his house, took away



the materials kept for construction of the house. The accused persons also demanded a ransom of Rs. 5,00,000/- and threatened him with dire consequences, if he failed to pay that amount. It has also been alleged that the accused persons fraudulently executed three sale deeds with respect to land of the complainant, while the High Court and Hon'ble Supreme Court have already declared the possession of the complaint over the land in question.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been framed up in this case. The petitioners claim that land on the basis of a sale deed executed by the mother of the complainant, to which the learned counsel for the complainant replied that it was a forged and fabricated sale deed.

5. Learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 02 have opposed the application of the petitioner and have submitted that the petitioners are criminals and they are trying to forcibly capture the land of the complainant.

6. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for opposite party no. 02 that the petitioners have along list of criminal antecedent also.



7. Learned counsel for the opposite party no. 02 has also produced a copy of the order sheet dated 5.8.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 71132 of 2023 by which the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners has been rejected.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the impugned order.

9. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Vikas/-

U			
---	--	--	--

