

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19747 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2017 Thana- TURKAULIYA District- East Champaran

Jeetendra Singh S/o Krishna Singh R/o vill - Sapahi, P.S.- Turkauliya, Distt.-
East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Naresh Sah S/o Late Lakshmi Sah R/o vill - Champapur Parshautampur,
P.S.- Ramgarhwa, Distt.- East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar No.III, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Indu Kumari Srivastava, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

8 03-12-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 327,
341, 384, 387, 406, 420, 456, 457, 468, 471 and 120(B) of the
Indian Penal Code as well as Section 138 of the N.I. Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that petitioner had shown 15 dhurs of land to the
informant. Further, the informant in total gave Rs.12,50,000/-,
thereafter, sale deed was executed by Ravi Ranjan Kumar
Mishra and petitioner was a witness on the sale deed. Further,
when the informant went to construct his house, said vendor



objected on the ground that the land sold is of some other plots. It is next alleged that the sale deed was executed by some other persons by affixing forged and fabricated photograph on the sale deed. It is next alleged that petitioner issued five cheques for an amount of Rs.7,57,000/- which on presentation for encashment bounced.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant alleges that sale deed was executed by Ravi Ranjan Kumar Mishra while petitioner was a witness on the sale deed. It is next submitted that petitioner had issued five cheques for an amount of Rs.7,57,000/- and it is alleged that the same on presentation for encashment bounced but then it is submitted that the said offence is a bailable offence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that informant alleges that it was petitioner who had shown 15 dhurs of land to the informant, the sale deed was executed by Ravi Ranjan Kumar Mishra and petitioner was a witness on the sale



deed but then when the informant went on the land for getting his house constructed then he came to know that a fraudulent act has been committed by the accused persons as the sale deed was executed by a person who was not the owner of the land but then had fixed a different photograph and petitioner became a witness on the sale deed. It is further submitted that if petitioner was a mere witness why he issued five cheques in favour of the informant which amply demonstrates his connivance also.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Turkauliya P.S. Case No. 59 of 2017 arising out of Complaint Case No. 32 of 2017 pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-IX, East Champaran at Motihari/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

