

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51458 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-378 Year-2022 Thana- AURANGABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Aurangabad

Navneet Kumar Son of Narendra Sharma R/o Vill.- Kanap, P.S. Daudnagar,
Dist.- Aurangabad, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Siyaram Kumar Son of Late Jagdish Kumar R/o Vill. and P.S.- Uphara,
Dist.- Aurangabad, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Aman Vishal, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 11-02-2025 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of Complaint Case No. 378 of 2022, disclosing
offences under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 406 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, as per the allegation made in
the complaint on 11.08.2021, complainant gave on rent his
Scorpio vehicle in favour of the petitioner having Registration
No. JH12K7658, Chassis No. MAITA2TDKJ2H30980 and
Engine No. TDJ4H88000 on monthly rental of Rs. 25000/-.
After sometime, complainant demanded from the petitioner



monthly rental of the vehicle, then the petitioner denied to pay and also denied to return his vehicle.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case on the basis of concocted story. The petitioner did not take any vehicle on rent from the complainant. As a matter of fact, a sum of Rs. 50,000/- was given by the petitioner to the complainant as a loan which were to be refunded within three months. When the petitioner demanded his money back, the present complaint case has been lodged in order to implicate the petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that at the behest of Witness No. 2 Baiju Kumar with whom the petitioner was not having good term and was on inimical terms, the present complaint has been lodged. Despite service of notice nobody appears for complainant opposite party no. 2.

5. Learned counsel for the State is present and opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Having regard to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation and the fact that there appears to be business/monetary relationship between the parties, I am inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.



7. This application is, accordingly, allowed.

8. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the Court below within four weeks, 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 Sub-divisional Judicial Magistrate, Daudnagar, Aurangabad, in connection with Complaint Case No. 378 of 2022, subject to the condition laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

Siwani/-

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

