

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26473 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2649 Year-2022 Thana- SARAN COMPLAINT CASE District-
Saran

-
1. Ramendra Kumar Singh @ Guddu Singh S/O Bali Bahadur Singh
 2. Sachendra Kumar Singh @ Munna Singh S/O Late Dinanath Singh
Both are R/O Mohalla- Mirchaiya Tola Daulatganj Chapra, P.S- Bhagwan
Bazar, District- Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Naseem Akhtar @ Nasim Akhtar S/O Late Yakub Miyan R/O Mohalla-
Daulatganj, Chiktoli, P.S- Bhagwan Bazar, Distt.- Saran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sunil Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-07-2025 Heard Mr.Sunil Prasad Singh, learned counsel for

the petitioners and Mr.Rabindra Kumar, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in
connection with Complaint P.S.Case No.2649/2022, registered
for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471,
120B of IPC.

3. The prosecution's case as per complaint petition of
Naseem Akhtar in short is that Sachendra Kumar Singh
(petitioner No.2) has been acquaintances of him since before
and that he resides in his neighbourhood. It is alleged that he



stated doing business with him. It is alleged on 10.12.2018 Sachendra Kumar Singh came to his place and asked him to hand over signed cheque in the matter of security and he handed over 3-4 signed cheques and after the payment, the financier returned the cheque. He also states that such things were normal behaviour in the matter of security transaction. However, on account of intervening Corona period, he forgot about getting return of the cheque. It is alleged that the accused issued legal notice through his advocate for the payment of the amount and then he learnt that under a conspiracy notice had been sent to him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation as alleged in the complaint petition is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint petition and the present complaint petition has been filed after filing of the complaint petition by petitioner No.1, namely, Ramendra Kumar Singh @ Guddu Singh bearing Complaint Case No.1620/2022. The present occurrence had taken place on 24.08.2022 then the present complaint petition has been filed on 22.08.2022 which suggests that when the complainant has received the notice about the aforesaid case filed by petitioner No.1 against opposite party



No.2 then he filed the false case against the petitioners.

5. Learned counsel for opposite party No.2 and learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, have vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one but fairly submits that the same was filed by opposite party No.2 against the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, the present case is counter blast of Complaint Case No. 1620 of 2022 and after taking cognizance, opposite party No.2 has filed the present complaint case, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their 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)each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate-1st Class, Saran, Chapra in connection with Complaint P.S.Case No.2649/2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the BNSS,2023 and with other following conditions:-

(I) Petitioners 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioners tamper 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 petitioners and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. 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)

Nitesh/-

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

