

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23327 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-785 Year-2016 Thana- MOTIHARI TOWN District- East
Champaran

=====

Raja Alam Son of Latif Mian Resident of Village - Pachrukha, P.S. -
Banjariya, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Amita Chakravarti Wife of Pradip Chakrawarti Resident of Village -
Amlapatti, Meena Bazar Nagar, P.S. - Motihari, District - East Champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Abhay Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Karandeep Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 10-09-2025

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection with Motihari Town P.S. Case no.785 of 2016 registered under sections 448, 386, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that on the death of her brother on 24.7.2016, the accused persons including the petitioner herein forcibly took her signature and thumb impression on a number of blank papers and also took away the Wagon R of the informant. Threats etc were given. It is further stated that the accused persons want to



usurp the immovable property of the informant. The informant and others were forced to leave the town.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. It is submitted that the brother of the informant had already sold the land in question by a registered sale deed dated 1.6.2016, a few months prior to his death. It is for this reason and the subsequent differences arising between the parties that the instant case has been lodged with false allegations levelled therein. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations are of a civil dispute. On the point of delay in moving the application for anticipatory bail, it is submitted that neither any process has been issued under sections 82 or 83 of the Cr.P.C. nor any non-bailable warrant has been issued nor has the petitioner been declared an absconder.

5. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned A.P.P for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the F.I.R. together with the fact that the petitioner having moved the application for anticipatory bail after almost nine years of



the registration of the FIR, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail and the application is rejected.

7. The petitioner is directed to surrender in the learned Court below within a period of four weeks.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saunavkrsinha/-

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

