

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23788 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1159 Year-2018 Thana- AURANGABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Aurangabad

=====

Sandhya Devi W/o Pappu Kumar @ Anand Kumar Singh R/o Village-
Sheikhpura Tole, Mohan Bigha, P.S.- Muffasil, Distt.- Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kishori Singh S/o Late Deo Saran Singh R/o vill - Poiwan, P.s.- Muffasil,
Distt.- Aurangabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mrs. Mukul Kumari, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Pushpa Sinha.1, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mrs. Leelawati Kumari, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

7 01-09-2025 Heard Mrs. Mukul Kumari, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mrs. Leelawati Kumari, learned counsel

representing the complainant beside learned APP representing

the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 1159 of 2018 registered
for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 406 of the
Indian Penal Code, lodged by the complainant Kishori Singh.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant, an
owner of the Petrol Pump was duped of Rs.25 Lakhs by the
accused person on the ground of expanding the business, this
payment was made in the year 2015, though neither they



expanded the business nor returned the amount instead, promised to execute a sale deed.

4. After much persuasion, an agreement was signed by the lady petitioner with the husband and others standing as witnesses. Subsequently, she changed her mind, legal notice sent, no reply which followed the complaint.

5. A perusal of the earlier order shows that before the coordinate Bench, the petitioner showed inclination to settle the matter with the complainant and accordingly on 11.08.2025 the same was adjourned.

6. Today on call, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is delay in lodging the complaint, the complainant further delayed in taking steps to incorporate the solemn affirmation and in that background, the allegation has to be rejected.

7. Learned counsel representing the complainant on the other hand has taken this Court to the counter affidavit to support the complaint by bringing on record the agreement paper in which the lady petitioner signed on 30.03.2015 with her husband standing as the witness.

8. It is a clear case where with an intention to cheat, the complainant of was promised of getting the business



expanded. In the process, the accused persons took away Rs. 25 Lakhs and even after lapse of a decade, instead of taking appropriate steps and/or face trial, are resorting to inexcusable tactics. In that background, no relief can be extended.

9. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

