

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11048 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-140 Year-2021 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Araria

Munna chaudhary S/o Chandra Shekhar Chaudhari @ Chandra Kishor Chaudhari Resident of village- Amhara ward no 11, police station- Forbesganj, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dukhni Devi W/o Suren Mandal R/o vill- Kamta, ward no. 7, P.S.- Forbesganj, Distt.- Araria

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Harendra Prasad, APP
For the O.P.-2	:	None

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State. Despite valid service of notice, nobody appears on behalf of complainant / opposite party no. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a complaint case punishable for the offence under Sections 323, 341, 379, 406 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The complainant has alleged that she opened an account in Punjab National Bank and gave total Rs. 52,000/- to this petitioner to deposit in her bank account and it is alleged that when complainant asked her money, this petitioner abused and assaulted her and also refused to return the alleged amount.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



from bare perusal of the complaint petition, it is apparent that alleged deposit was made by complainant in the year 2016, but this complaint has been filed after lapse of five years, which itself suggests false implication of the petitioner. In fact, complainant never entrusted any money to the petitioner to deposit in bank. The petitioner was C.S.P. operator in between 2014-2017 and during this period, the complainant deposited the alleged amount and also withdrew it. Moreover, the matter has been compromised between the parties and to this effect, a compromise petition has been filed in the Court below on 29.11.2024 (Annexure P/3 to the petition). Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the delay in lodging the complaint petition, clean antecedent of petitioner and *factum* of compromise between the parties, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner is allowed. Accordingly, in the event of arrest/surrender before the Court below 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 A.C.J.M 1st, Araria in connection with Complaint Case
No. 140 of 2021, subject to condition as laid down under
Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay

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

