

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18789 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-228 Year-2024 Thana- Kavaiya District- Lakhisarai

Manish Viraj S/O Sunil Mahto R/O Mohalla - Pachna Road, P.S- Kavaiya,
Dist.- Lakhisarai Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Rajive Ranjan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh
For the Informant/s :	Mr. Munish Kumar, Advocate
	Ms. Minakshi Kumari, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 16-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP
for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehend his arrest in connection with Kavaiya P.S. Case No. 228 of 2024 for the offence registered under sections 318(2), 316(2) and 351(2) of B.N.S. lodged on 24.10.2024 by the informant Harsh Kumar.

3. As per the prosecution story, the allegation is that the petitioner with an intention to cheat executed an agreement for a piece of land in the District of Lakhisarai and took away Rs. 29,50,000/-, however, neither the land was registered nor the amount returned and later started threatening the informant of dire consequences, this led to the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has not signed any document, it is a forged one, in any case it is a civil case.



5. Learned counsel for the informant on the other hand with the help of counter affidavit has taken this Court to annexure 8 to show that petitioner has signed the agreement papers which clearly shows his signature and the same matches the signature on vakalatnama. Further, despite service of copy to them on 17.07.2025 and the agreement paper having been brought on record by way of affidavit they have not taken any criminal action against the informant which clearly show that the purpose is to usurp the amount.

6. Considering the submission of the parties as also the valid points that has been raised by the learned counsel for the informant, Ms. Minakshi Kumari, clearly the agreement shows the signature of the petitioner and the fact that he has now taken a u-turn endorses the allegation of the informant that the intention was to cheat and not to execute the sale deed.

7. This Court cannot take its eyes away from the paragraph 3 which show that he has criminal antecedent also, in that background, no relief can be extended, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Raj Ranjan/-

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

