

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22013 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-944 Year-2023 Thana- GANDHIMAIDAN District- Patna

1. Lalit Mohan Rai S/O Late Jaypal Rai Resident of Village- Kanhauli, P.S.- Bihta, District- Patna
2. Lalit Rai S/O Late Lorik Rai Resident of Village- Kanhauli, P.S.- Bihta, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. N.K. Agrawal, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Satish Chandra, Advocate
	:	Ms. Diskha Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ramesh Chandra, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 02-05-2025 Heard Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners
and Learned A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in connection with Gandhi Maidan P.S. Case No. 944 of 2023 lodged on 26.11.2023, for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 379, 420, 120(B) of the IPC.

3. As per the prosecution, the informant alleged that the petitioners called her husband to do some work of calculation, but subsequently they forcefully took him to the Registry office and got executed the sale deed of around sixty khata of land.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no



offence. Counsel submits that the occurrence took place on 30.10.2023 but the FIR has been lodged on 26.11.2023. Counsel further submits that even if for the sake of argument it is presumed that allegation is correct, then the informant has to file an application for cancellation of deed not the present case. Counsel further submits that other co-accused has been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.498 of 2025. Counsel further submits that criminal antecedent of the petitioner no.1 is clean and the criminal antecedent of the petitioner no.2 is not clean as there are two cases pending against petitioner no.2 in which in all the cases, he is on bail.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioners and submits that, from bare reading of the FIR, it transpires that offence has been constituted against the petitioners.

6. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

anand/-

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

