

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30501 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1204 Year-2022 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - PATNA CITY  
District- Patna

=====

Ajay Kumar Mehta Son of Ram Chandra Prasad Mehta, Proprietor of M/s Arts, Resident of Village- Maharana Pratap Nagar, Yodha Nagar, New Area, Aurangabad, Po and Ps- Aurangabad, Kuvcheri AR, District- Aurangabad, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Suman Kumar Sinha Son of Anil Prasad Resident of B.N.R. Road, PS- Sultanganj, District- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                                              |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Rikesh Sinha, Advocate     |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr. Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP<br>Mr. Jibendra Mishra, Advocate |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      10-09-2025                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant/opposite party no.2.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of anticipatory bail apprehending his arrest in connection with C.A. no.1204 of 2022, registered under sections 420, 406, 463, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant sold a paper printing machine to the petitioner which was valued at Rs.7.5 lacs. Out of the total consideration amount, the petitioner having returned an old machine, the value thereof to the tune of



Rs.2.5 lacs was set off and as per the prosecution case the balance amount of Rs.5 lacs has to be paid by the petitioner to the complainant. The same not having been paid, the complainant filed the instant complaint.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. From perusal of the contents of the complaint petition itself it would transpire that the dispute, if any, between the parties is one of business transaction and a civil dispute. In fact, filing of the instant criminal case is an abuse of the process of Court. No amount remains due as per the petitioner's case. The petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the learned Court below.

5. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that it is not in dispute that the machine in question was supplied to the petitioner for which he had to pay a sum of Rs.7.5 lacs. The amount was not given to the complainant and on the complainant pressing for the same, the petitioner gave threats. This lead to the complainant giving a pleader notice and finally lodging a complaint under section 420 of the Indian Penal Code wherein cognizance has been taken in the learned Court below.



6. On a enquiry by the Court, learned counsel for the complainant submits that he has no instructions as to whether any money suit for recovery of the amount has been filed by the complainant or not.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations against the petitioner in the F.I.R., the allegations arising out of a dispute with respect to sale and purchase of printing machine, in the facts of the case it is directed that the petitioner above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with C.A. no.1204 of 2022 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate I<sup>st</sup> Class, Patna City, Patna.

**(Partha Sarthy, J)**

avinash/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

