

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26932 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-727 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - PATNA CITY
District- Patna

=====

Mahendra Rajak @ Mahendra Kumar S/o Late Hari Nandan Rajak R/o
Mohalla - Bari Pahari, P.S.- Agamkuan, Distt- Patna, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rahul Raj Singh S/o Late Wakil Mahto R/o vill and Post- Bari Pahari, P.S.-
Agamkuan, Distt.- Patna, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Avanish Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP
For the Informant	:	None

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 31-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State. Despite valid service of notice, none

appears on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with

Complaint Case No. 727 of 2023, instituted for the offences

punishable under Sections 420 and 504 of the Indian Penal

Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the

complainant alleged that he went into an agreement of a price of

land situated at Mauza Pahari having plot no. 1206, khata no.

189, area 1500 Sq. Ft. after seeing the agreement paper of the



same plot by the petitioner, complainant paid Rs. 8 lakhs and when he went to the real owner of land, he denied to have any agreement with the petitioner and denied to sell the same land.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the entire allegation against the petitioner is totally false. It is further submitted that a sale agreement has been made between the real owner (Gautam Sinha) of land and the petitioner that was being valid upto 28.01.2022. Complainant got sale agreement on the basis of the said agreement and the complainant had seen the pre-agreement before it. Complainant paid only Rs. 3 lakh on 31.08.2020 on the date of said sale agreement out of Rs. 40 lakhs and began to find customer for sale. The petitioner is in custody since 14.11.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 727 of 2023.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

