

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75321 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-156 Year-2024 Thana- PARASBIGHA District- Jehanabad

Mintu Ranjan W/O Amitabh Ranjan @ Pappu Sharma R/O Vill.- Sendhwa
P.S.- Parasbigha District - Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Prawesh Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nawal Kishore Prasad, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 11-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Parasbigha P.S. Case No. 156 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 120B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Allegedly, petitioner having conspiracy with other co-accused is said to have cheated the informant by giving him false promise of payment for construction of temple with sand stone. Co-accused Pappu Sharma gave him cheques on different dates, but due to insufficient amount, the money could not be withdrawn. It is further alleged that after death of co-accused Pappu Sharma in 2021, the petitioner, wife of co-



accused Pappu Sharma, refused to make payment in respect of dues amount.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged has ever taken place. She has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is totally false and based on concocted facts. She has been made accused in the present case merely because she is wife of co-accused Pappu Sharma. She never issued any cheque in favour of the informant and she had no knowledge with regard to the alleged occurrence. Nothing specific has been attributed against her. There is inordinate and abnormal delay of five years in lodging the FIR without assigning any plausible and convincing reason for the said delay, which creates serious doubt about the prosecution case. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has one criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory



bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

