

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26027 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1181 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - PATNA CITY
District- Patna

=====

Ranju Devi W/o- Akhilesh Kumar Singh R/O village-S.k. Puram ,Arya samaj
Lane -15 , Shashi veena complex Apartment , Flat no . 102 , P.s- Rupaspur
,District - Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shyam Kishore Singh S/o- Late Ramnaresh Singh R/o- Biscomaun Colony
Ashok Vihar Po- Guljarbagh Ps- Alamganj Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ranvijay Narain Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Aditya Narayan Singh.1, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Prakash Chandra Agrawal, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 20-08-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1181 of 2023 for the offence punishable under Sections 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, lodged by the complainant Shyam Kishore Singh.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant alleged that the petitioner work as Petty Contractor wanted financial help and was given Rs. 25 Lakhs in two installments on 14.09.2020. However, she had an intention to cheat and provided two cheques which was found to be of an account which is closed. Later upon demand, threat was issued, left with



no alternative, the complaint.

4. In this case, earlier notices were issued to the opposite party no.2 on 16.05.2025 who has since appeared.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the financial transactions used to take place between the parties, in continuation of that the payment has been made double of what was taken by the petitioner and has also brought forward the chart to support the case. Upon query, when double of the amount has been cleared and the complainant chose to file case, why steps not taken against her, there is no answer.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant on the other hand has drawn attention of this Court to the chart to show that earlier, payments were made to the petitioner which was returned and those payments have also been incorporated in the chart. He submits that the amount was taken on 14.09.2020 but the chart shows the payments that were made in the year 2018 and 2019 and even in 2020 prior to 14.09.2020.

7. Taking into account the aforesaid facts as also their false submission that was made before this Court that all the payments have been made after 14.09.2025 whereas the chart shows contrary to that, in that background, it would be appropriate that the petitioner seek bail.



8. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected and the interim protection granted to the petitioner on 16.05.2025 stands vacated.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

