

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48353 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-348 Year-2024 Thana- BHOJPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Bhojpur

=====

Sidhnath Singh S/O Late Bindeshwari Singh R/O Mohalla- Hari Jee Ka Hata,
Ara, P.S.- Ara Nawadah, Dist.- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Aman Kumar S/O Suresh Singh R/O Vill.- Bali Sonversa, P.S.- Navanagar,
Dist.- Buxar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Abhay Kumar, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Y.C. Verma, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-08-2025 Heard Mr. Akash Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned Senior counsel for the complainant and Mr. Abhay Kumar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 348(C) of 2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the petitioner and co-accused persons, in the name of providing job in the Civil Court, has received Rs. 10,00,000/- from the complainant. Thereafter the co-accused persons have also given appointment



letter to the complainant.

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 although the petitioner is named in the complaint petition, but from a bare perusal of the complaint petition, it appears that co-accused, namely, Dilip Singh has received the amount in question from the complainant in his bank account and, in fact, co-accused Dilip Singh was the tenant in the house of the petitioner and on the sole ground that the co-accused was the tenant in the house of the petitioner, the petitioner has been made accused in the present complaint petition.

5. Mr. Yogesh Chandra Verma, learned Senior counsel for the complainant as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons have received the amount in question from the complainant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioner has clean antecedent and he has not received any amount from the complainant, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his 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 Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-IX, Bhojpur at Ara in connection with Complaint Case No. 348(C) of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 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)

saauravkrsinha/-

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

