

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11345 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-905 Year-2019 Thana- SAHARSA COMPLAINT CASE
District- Saharsa

=====

Pankaj Kumar Yadav @ Netaji @ Pankaj Yadav son of Shiv Narayan Yadav
@ Shivanarayan Prasad Yadav village- Ghoghapatti, Ps- sour Bazar, Dist-
Saharsa

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajdeo Prasad Yadav Son of Late Anandi Yadav village- Gordah, Ps-
Salkhua, Dist- Saharsa

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satish Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 02-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

counsel representing the informant as also learned APP

representing the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Saharsa Complaint Case No. 905C of 2019 for
the offence under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, lodged
by the complainant Rajdev Prasad Yadav.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant
alleged that he being an educated person used to take tuition in
the village for his livelihood, the petitioner approached him and
asked him to pay some amount so that he can procure a seat of
teacher for him. Allegation is that accepting his words, the



payments were made as follows:

(i) on 16.08.2007, Rs. 24,000/-;

(ii) on 16.08.2008, Rs. 35,100/-;

(iii) on 15.11.2011, Rs.90,000/-.

4. However, thereafter the petitioner kept on assuring him but when he starting evading the complainant, was confronted, a panchayati took place, but he chose to look the other way which led to the present case.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a bare perusal of the date would show that after the year 2011, he took time in filing the complaint which puts a question mark on his bonafide. Further submission is that he has no criminal antecedent, his name has been brought on record due to village politics and no documentary evidence on record.

6. To a query why he has approached the Court in the year 2025, the submission is that the cognizance took place in the year 2022.

7. Mr. Amarnath Jha learned counsel representing the informant and he has provided a document between the parties not disputed by the petitioner that it has not been signed by Pankaj Kumar Yadav (the petitioner herein). It shows the bonafide of the allegation made in the complaint petition.



8. Let the said document provided by Mr. Amarnath Jha be kept on record. Further, if the petitioner disputes his signature, he is well advised to lodge appropriate case civil/criminal case against the complainant.

9. As per the own submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner, the cognizance took place in the year 2022, he took time of three years in coming before this Court, in that background, it would be appropriate that he seek bail.

10. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

