

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49718 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2025 Thana- Chitragupta Nagar District- Khagaria

Navin Kumar @ Navin Kumar Gupta S/o- Late Ramesh Kumar Gupta @
Late Ramesh Prasad Sah Mohalla- Murgichak W.No-8, Ps Dist- Khagaria
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Hafiz Shahbaz Arif
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 30-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Chitraguptnagar P.S. Case No. 32 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 3(5) of BNS.

3. According to the allegation, the petitioner manufactured a forged registered document no. 1543, dated 25-05-1955, which is a sale deed relating to Mauza Bela Simri. The revenue authorities verified the authenticity / genuineness of that deed from the registry office, and the registry office reported that document no. 1543, dated 25-05-1955, was relating to village Sanhauuli and not to the village Bela Simri. On the basis of that forged deed, the petitioner filed a case in the



court of DCLR, Khagaria, as Land Dispute Case No. 175 of 2022-23. During inquiry, it also came to the light that Jamabandi Nos. 518 and 581 were prepared and uploaded online through the forged and fabricated process, after creating false document.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. The inquiry under Section 340 of Cr.P.C. is required before lodging the case.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the State opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that inquiry is not required because the document was fabricated and subsequently it was presented before the court of DCLR, Khagaria. He has submitted further that the petitioner has criminal history of similar nature of cases.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

kundan/-

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

