

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40277 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-568 Year-2020 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - ROSERA
District- Samastipur

Ashok Kumar Ray @ Ashok Ray S/O Suryanarayan Ray Resident of Village-
Kalyanpur, P.S- Bibhutipur, District- Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sikander Ray S/O Ram Balak Ray R/O Village- Kalyanpur Milki, P.S-
Bibhutipur, Distt.- Samastipur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Raja Ram Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 01-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and
420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that the petitioner indulges in the business of fake notes and
giving loans. Further, the complainant had taken a loan from the
petitioner on account of which a dispute arose, for which a
panchayati was convened, and the complainant returned an
amount of Rs. 2,65,000/- to the petitioner and the same was



video-graphed. But the petitioner, even after receiving an amount of Rs. 2,65,000/-, was disputing the loan amount and thus instituted a false case against the complainant with a view to assert his land by alleging that the complainant executed an agreement for selling his land but resiled from the agreement.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that from the perusal of the allegations made in the complaint, it would manifest that the complainant himself alleges that since the petitioner instituted a false case against him, as such, he has implicated the instant case in order to save himself. It is further submitted that the complainant had executed an agreement for sale with respect to a piece of land and after receiving money, when the sale deed was not executed, the petitioner instituted the said case in the court of competent civil jurisdiction.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-



(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 568 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Neha/-

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

