

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78935 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-648 Year-2022 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

-
-
1. Jitendra Kumar Singh Son of Shyam Hari Singh @ Shyam Hari Rai @ Shyam Hari Ray @ Shyam Hari @ Late Shyam Hari Ray R/o - Khushhal Chak, P.S - Gaurichak, District - Patna
 2. Surendra Kumar Singh Son of Shyam Hari Singh @ Shyam Hari Rai @ Shyam Hari Ray @ Shyam Hari @ Late Shyam Hari Ray R/o - Khushhal Chak, P.S - Gaurichak, District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Diwakar., Advocate
		Mr. Kumar Pushp Gaurav, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Girish Chandra Sharma, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 02-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Bihta P.S. Case No. 648 of 2022 instituted for the offence under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution based on the complaint petition is that the complainant has purchased altogether 60 Decimals of land through sale deed and that he was paying rent of the sale deed and also it is further alleged that the petitioners along with one another have got the land mutated in their favour on the basis of forged documents.

4. During course of the argument, learned counsel for the petitioners has discussed the Annexure-2 which is joint partition



deed. He has submitted that on the basis of this deed they have got the land mutated.

5. In contra, learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the prayer of bail of the petitioners. Learned counsel for the informant, Mr. Girish Chandra Sharma is also present in the Court. He has vehemently opposed the bail and has stated that not only the said joint partition deed rather the said document was also forged by the petitioners. They got the land mutated in their names. It has also been submitted that this deeds were presented before the Circle Officer and he has not believed and has found that the deeds are forged one.

6. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners have got the land mutated in their name on the basis of the forged deed. The argument advanced by the learned counsel for the informant has got force in it. The investigation is still under progress.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case as stated above, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

8. Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)

durgesh/-

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

