

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20406 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-162 Year-2021 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - BARH District-
Patna

-
1. Md. Imteyaz Ali @ Imtiyaz Ali S/o- Late Wali Ahmad Siddiqui Vill- Chondi, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Barh, Dist- Patna
 2. Md. Mumtaz Ali @ Mumtaz Ali S/o- Late Wali Ahmad Siddiqui Vill- Chondi, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Barh, Dist- Patna
 3. Md. M. Aslam Ali @ Md. Aslam Ali S/o- Late Wali Ahmad Siddiqui Vill- Chondi, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Barh, Dist- Patna
 4. Md. Naushad Ali S/o- Late Wali Ahmad Siddiqui Vill- Chondi, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Barh, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Md. Shaukat Ali S/o- Late Ali Ahmad Siddiqui vill- Hafiz Karmaour, P.S.- Pandarak, presently residing at - vill- Chondi , ward no. 6, P.S.- Barh, Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

7 16-09-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. C 162/2021 instituted under Sections 323, 341, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the Indian Penal Code filed on 24.03.2021 by the complainant, Md. Shaukat Ali.

3. As per complaint, the complainant alleged that Naushad Ali and Imteyaz Ali reside in Dubai for their



livelihood, both being brothers of the complainant. He on his sweet will performed “Nikah” in Delhi with Anjum. However, when they returned to the native house, were ousted which resulted into the lady lodging a case as Barh P.S. Case No. 236 of 2016 against the accused persons.

4. Further, when the Police arrived to arrest them, they took signature of the complainant on blank paper followed by the filing of anticipatory bail. Later, the accused persons threw them out of the house. The allegation is that the papers that were taken by the accused persons that was used to incorporate a title deed against the complainant was completely forged and fabricated document inasmuch as the signatory to it, the brothers residing at Dubai never came to India in the year 2016. He came to know about the entire fraudulent act by the accused persons only after coming to know about the Title suit no. 156 of 2018 pending before the competent Court at Barh. This followed the complaint.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that all of them are brothers, he wanted to pursue medical study and for that, surrendered his own piece of land to the brothers and they in turn gave economic support. However, later, he chose to take back his land and only to pressurize, the present case.



6. Learned counsel representing the complainant submits that not only they forged the documents to make a surrender deed certificate, even in para-3 they have wrongly stated about the facts and when the counter affidavit was filed bringing on record paragraphs 7 and 8 to show that they have suppressed criminal history, in the rejoinder, in paragraph-14, it has been stated that they had no knowledge about it.

7. Learned counsel for complainant has provided the photo copy of the stamped document to show that beside the wrong statement that was made in para-3 about the criminal antecedent, on affidavit, false narration has been given that they had no knowledge about the criminal history inasmuch as, the document shows that on 22.06.2016 itself, years before filing the present petition, the surrender cum bail application was filed before the competent Court at Barh.

8. A perusal of the same would show that the submissions put forward by the learned counsel for the complainant is/are correct.

9. Learned APP, Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh has taken this Court to another document to show that in between, the process has already been issued against the petitioners herein.

10. Taking into account the aforesaid facts including



the submissions of the learned counsel for the complainant that they suppressed the criminal history and tried once again make false narration that they had no knowledge despite the fact that surrender cum bail application was preferred in the year 2016, no case for relief is made out.

11. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

