

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47655 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1178 Year-2019 Thana- GOPALGANJ COMPLAINT CASE
District- Gopalganj

-
1. Srikant Chauhan S/o- Radhe Shyam Chauhan Village- Nonia Toli, P.S.- Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj
 2. Sita Devi W/o- Srikant Chauhan Village- Nonia Toli, P.S.- Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj
 3. Rajiv Ranjan Chauhan S/o- Srikant Chauhan Village- Nonia Toli, P.S.- Gopalganj, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dwarika Bhagat S/o- Late Manager Bhagat Village- Koini Mathia Tola Ps- Manjhagarh Dist- Gopalganj

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Raghav Prasad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Rajendra Singh Shastri, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 19-08-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a complaint case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 406, 323, 384, 506, 504 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, complainant alleged that he is owner of a passenger vehicle and he came into contact with the accused persons, including these petitioners and



thereafter, for providing government job, accused persons took Rs. 15,00,000/- from the complainant but failed to carry out their promise. It is further alleged that when the petitioners did not provide the job within the stipulated time, complainant put pressure upon the accused persons and asked to return his money then Petitioner No. 2, namely Sita Devi, returned Rs. 3,90,000/- through bank cheque and thereafter, all the accused persons refused to return rest of the amount and also threatened of dire consequences.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. From bare perusal of the complaint petition it is apparent that specific accusation of cheating is against co-accused Raju Tiwari.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in the complaint petition with specific accusation that they took Rs. 15,00,000/- from the complainant for proving job but neither provided job nor returned the money. Petitioner No. 1 has got three criminal antecedents, Petitioner No. 2 has got two criminal antecedents and Petitioner No. 3 has got one criminal antecedent



of similar nature.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, specific and direct nature of accusation and criminal antecedents of the petitioners, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

