

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31869 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-305 Year-2023 Thana- GANDHIMAIDAN District- Patna

Dharmendra Kumar Son of Sri Braj Kishore Prasad RO- Rajni Complex
Mithapur Sabzi Mandi, PS- Jakkanpur District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
 2. Sushma Sharma Wife of Late Vijay Kumar Village- Nath House, near SBI
Mithapur, Khagaul Road, Po - GPO, Ps- Jakkanpur, Dist- patna
- Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Amrit Abhijat
For the State	:	Mr.Tapeshwar Sharma
For the informant	:	Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 25-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for
the offences punishable u/s 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of
the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case as disclosed in the first
information report is that one Sushma Sharma upon receipt of
information that few persons had impersonated her and her son
Nishant Kumar and sold her ancestral land by way of registry,
the informant visited the registry office and found that one
Shravan Kumar had impersonated himself to be the son of
Sushma Sharma and registered her land in the name of one
Pranav Kumar.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



money in lieu of the sale of the land was received in the account of Shravan Kumar which was transferred by Pranav Kumar. The said Pranav Kumar, however, upon knowledge of the entire facts, filed an FIR against the accused persons including the present petitioner. Out of a total amount of Rs. 1,28,00,000/-, Rs. 73,00,000/- was paid by Shravan Kumar in the account of Pranav Kumar and the remaining amount of Rs. 55,00,000/- was also returned to the said Pranav Kumar by the present petitioner who was acting as a mediator in the entire transaction and was also a witness of the sale deed. On the strength of the above-mentioned facts, it is submitted that no loss has occurred to the informant and the amount which was received by the accused persons has already been returned to Pranav Kumar. It is further submitted that the informant has also filed a title suit making this petitioner and the said Pranav Kumar as defendants to declare the sale deed no. 18590 dated 14.12.2022 as null and void. The said suit has been admitted, notices have been issued and Pranav Kumar has already filed his W.S. stating that he has no claim upon the said land.

5. Learned counsel for the informant, however, opposes the grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the informant is still suffering as he has to contest the title suit to



prove his own ownership on his land.

6. Taking into account the fact that there is no financial loss to the informant in the entire transaction, let the above named petitioner in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, be enlarged on bail 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 court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Gandhi Maidan P.S. Case No. 305 of 2023, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. However, since undue harassment has been caused to the informant for no fault, an offer has been made on behalf of the petitioner that he would be making a payment of Rs. 25,000/- as a token of compensation on his behalf.

8. In case the petitioner is found to be made an accused in any further case of similar nature, his bail bonds in the present case would also automatically stand cancelled.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

