

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25394 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8439 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Satyendra Pandey @ Pandey Ji S/o Adheya Pandey R/o Manas Marg, Road
No. 2, Pandey Jee grill workshop, Shivpuri, P.S.- Shastrinagar, Distt.- Patna
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjiv Kumar S/o Late Rajendra Prasad Singh R/o
Krishnagar Kuli Para, Sahebganj, P.s. and Distt.- Sahebganj, Jharkhand
... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Hemant Kumar, Advocate Mr. Gaurav Prakash, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Parmanand Kumar, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Madhumay Madhup, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-06-2025 Heard Mr. Hemant Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner, Mr. Parmanand Kumar, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State and Mr. Madhumay Madhup, learned
counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 8439(C) of 2023 for the
offences punishable under Sections 323, 379, 384, 420, 467, 468,
471, 120-B of the IPC and 27 of the Arms Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the petitioner along with
other co-accused persons is said to have transferred the land in favour
of Harendra Thakur and Ravi Kumar Singh by producing forged
papers in the name of Pappu Singh.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the complaint petition is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the complaint petition. He further submits that from the perusal of the complaint petition, it appears that one Pappu Singh has sold the land in question in favour of Harendra Thakur and Ravi Kumar Singh and the petitioner is distant relative of the Harendra Thakur. It is further submitted that the petitioner is neither the owner nor the purchaser of the land in question. He is not the beneficiary of the land in question and has been made accused only on the ground that he is distant relative of the purchaser, namely, Harendra Thakur.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons has conspired in the present case and sold the land in question which belongs to the complainant's father.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner has clean antecedent and there is no material on the record which suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like



amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patna in connection with Complaint Case No. 8439(C) of 2023, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ 482 (2) of the BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

priyanka/-

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

