

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19256 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1734 Year-2022 Thana- BHAGALPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Bhagalpur

-
1. Anirudh Mandal S/O Late Sundar Mandal Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur.
 2. Umesh Mandal @ Umer Mandal S/O Late Sundar Mandal Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur
 3. Vikash Mandal @ Vikash Kumar Mandal S/O Anirudh Mandal Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur
 4. Amarjeet Mandal @ Amarjeet Kumar S/O Anirudh Mandal Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur
 5. Mithun Mandal @ Mithun Kumar S/O Umesh Mandal Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Arun Prasad Yadav S/O Late Yogendra Yadav Resident of Village-Taraita, P.S-Sultanganj, District- Bhagalpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Jha
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Braj Kishore Pd.(App)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the informant



alleges that his father had purchased 66 decimal of land vide registered sale deed dated 04.08.2005 from the father of petitioner no.1 and 2, further the land was mutated in the name of the father of the informant, even Land Possession Certificate was issued by the Anchal Office, Sultanganj, it is next alleged that on 21.08.2021, the informant came to know that government out of 66 decimal of land, had acquired 63 decimal of land for NH-80, but he came to know that petitioners in connivance with the Circle Officer and the Circle Inspector, Sultanganj got prepared false Land Possession Certificate, Jamabandi Register etc. with regard to the land in dispute.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that the informant alleges that the land in dispute was purchased by his father from the father of petitioner no.1 and 2 vide registered sale deed dated 04.08.2005, it is next submitted that it has been specifically pleaded at Para-12 of the anticipatory bail application that father of petitioner no.1 and 2 died on 02.10.2003, it is thus submitted that if father of the petitioner no.1 and 2 died on 02.10.2003, how come the sale deed with respect to the land in dispute was executed in the name of the



father of the informant by the father of the petitioner no.1 and 2. It is next submitted that a supplementary affidavit has been filed on 24.06.2025 and from perusal of Annexure-P/9 to the supplementary affidavit, it would manifest that the same is the death certificate of the father of the petitioner no.1 and 2 and the death certificate records that the father of the petitioner no.1 and 2 died on 02.10.2003, as such it is submitted that the sale deed executed in favour of the father of the informant appears to be forged and fabricated. It is next submitted that petitioners filed T.S. No.78/2023 in the Court of learned Sub-Judge-I, Bhagalpur for getting the sale deed executed in the name of the father of the informant cancelled. It is also submitted that the informant has also appeared in the said title suit. It is next submitted that an amount of Rs.24 lacs by way of compensation was to be given to the petitioner no.1 and 2 but then the same was not disbursed on account of objection raised by the informant. It is also submitted that in the event if the title suit succeeds whether it would be prudent for this Court at this stage to send the petitioners to jail in the nature of allegation as alleged.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners but then are not in a position



to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners based on the death certificate of the father of petitioner no.1 and 2 that the sale deed could not have been executed in favour of the father of the informant in the year 2005 when the father of the petitioner no.1 and 2 died in the year 2003.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No.1734/2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

