

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3413 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-101 Year-2015 Thana- SAMASTIPUR District- Samastipur

Pappu Chaudhary @ Pappu Kumar Chaudhary Son of Shri Gopal Chaudhary
Resident of Village - Harpur Mahamda, P.S. - Pusa, District - Samastipur,
Present Address- Village - Madhuban, Post and P.S. - Madhuban, Gulwara
Madhuban, District - East Champaran, Bihar - 845420

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Saket Kumar Jha, Advocate Mr. Pramod Kumar Yadav, Advocate Mr. Vibhuti Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 19-02-2025 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 341, 323, 406, 465, 468 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, it is alleged that despite receiving consideration money of Rs. 2,36,000/- from the informant, this petitioner refused to execute the sale deed in his favour.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. As per prosecution case, the alleged payment was made in the year 2012, however, the present F.I.R.



has been lodged after inordinate delay of three years in 2015 and there is no plausible explanation for the same. As a matter of fact, both parties agreed to sell and purchase the land in question for Rs. 2,36,000/- but when the petitioner asked the informant for payment of consideration money, he kept on evading and as a result, petitioner did not execute the sale deed in his favour. It is further submitted that there is no chit of paper on record to support the allegations leveled against the petitioner. Moreover, from bare perusal of the F.I.R. it is apparent that the dispute is civil in nature with regard to sale and purchase of land and none of the acts allegedly committed by this petitioner would give rise to any criminal liability. Petitioner claims clean antecedents.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, nature of dispute, delay in lodging of the F.I.R. and clean antecedents of the petitioner, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is allowed.

7. Accordingly, in the event of arrest/surrender within a period of eight weeks from today, let the above named



petitioner be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Samastipur in connection with Samastipur Town P.S. Case No. 101 of 2015, subject to condition as laid down under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S..

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

