

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68020 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-613 Year-2022 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Uday Kumar Son of Mahendra Gope Resident of Village- Ashokpur, P.S.
Danapur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Randhir Kumar Son of Late Dharmendra Singh Resident of Village-
Bhagwatipur, P.S. Shahpur, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Chandra

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Nirmala Kumari

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-12-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No.613© of 2022, registered for the
offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 474,
506, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
complainant and Ravindra Singh are agnates and they are
having dispute relating to property, for which, Title Suit
No.252/2022 is pending adjudication in the court of learned
Sub-Judge-1, Danapur. It is further submitted that even
Ravindra Singh has share in the property, as such, he sold the



property in dispute in favour of the petitioner. It is thus submitted that petitioner is purchaser of the land in question, hence the petitioner be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner has antecedent of six cases and the price of the land in the State of Bihar, specially Patna has sky rocketed. It is also submitted that it appears that Ravindra Singh sold the land to the petitioner only with a view to coerce the complainant into submission so that the complainant is not in a position to dispute the sale made to a criminal.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP and also taking into consideration the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

