

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54335 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-341 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - ROSERA
District- Samastipur

-
1. Prince Kumar S/o Vijay Kumar Mahto R/o Ward no. 06, Singhia Buzurg Uttar, Singhia Buzurg, Samastipur, Bihar- 848236.
 2. Priyam Kumar S/o Vijay Kumar Mahto R/o Ward no. 06, Singhia Buzurg Uttar, Singhia Buzurg, Samastipur, Bihar- 848236.
 3. Chameli Devi @ Chameli Kumari W/o Vijay Kumar Mahto R/o Ward no. 06, Singhia Buzurg Uttar, Singhia Buzurg, Samastipur, Bihar- 848236.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dharam Alok S/o Late Jay Kumar Sah R/o Vill and Post- Singhia Buzurg Uttar, Ward No. 07, P.S.- Bibhutipur, Distt- Samastipur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashank Shekhar Kunwar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madhura Nand Jha, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 392, 379, 420, 467, 468, 474, 504 and 506/34 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have antecedent of one case and petitioner no. 3 is a woman and the complainant alleges that accused persons including the petitioners got a registered sale deed executed



with respect to a piece of land in favour of the complainant by Vijay Kumar in January, 2024. Further, Prince Kumar (petitioner no. 1) on 08.05.2024 came on the land and disclosed that the land was registered in his favour by his grandfather Sone Lal Mahto, hence, asked the complainant to leave. Further, on the same day, all the accused intercepted the complainant and Prince Kumar put a pistol on his ear and snatched Rs.15,000/- while Priyam Kumar (petitioner no. 2) took his watch and Chameli Devi (petitioner no. 3) snatched his chain.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that on account of dispute relating to land, the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is next submitted that the land belongs to the grandfather of petitioner no. 1 who had registered the same in favour of the petitioner no. 1 by a registered sale deed which was being claimed by the complainant. It is also submitted that it is very easy to implicate someone by filing a complaint case. It is submitted that had an FIR been instituted, the police would have investigated the case and the truth would come to the fore. It is further submitted that allegation of putting pistol on ear of



the informant is an exaggerated allegation as cognizance has not been taken under the Arms Act.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, let the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 341 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

