

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59971 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1122 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Banka

1. Dilip Pandit son of Jageshwar Pandit Resident Of Village - Mohanpur Jakha, Po- Devipur, Ps- Jasidih, Dist- Deoghar, Jharkhand,, At Present Residing at Village- Domkatta, Ps- Katoria, Dist- Banka
2. Sopadi Pandit @ Sufali Pandit Son of Jageshwar Pandit Resident Of Village - Mohanpur Jakha, Po- Devipur, Ps- Jasidih, Dist- Deoghar, Jharkhand,, At Present Residing at Village- Domkatta, Ps- Katoria, Dist- Banka
3. Munna Pandit @ Munna Kr. Pandit Son of jageshwar Pandit Resident Of Village - Mohanpur Jakha, Po- Devipur, Ps- Jasidih, Dist- Deoghar, Jharkhand,, At Present Residing at Village- Domkatta, Ps- Katoria, Dist- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Tara Devi Wife of Chhedhi Pandit Residing at Village- Domkatta, Ps- Katoria, Dist- Banka

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Nurul Hoda
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Narsingh Tanti

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 420, 461, 467, 471, 323, 379, 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and are sons of
Jageshwar Pandit. It is next submitted that the informant alleges



that she is wife of Chhedi Pandit and she purchased a piece of land vide sale deed dated 20.07.2002 from Jageshwar Pandit, but in the sale deed inadvertently, name of her husband was recorded as Jageshwar Pandit instead of Chhedi Pandit, but the said mistake in the sale deed was later rectified, but Jageshwar Pandit taking advantage of the said mistake fraudulently got the purchased land of the complainant mutated in the name of his wife Shanti Devi vide portraying her as wife of Bhuneshwar Pandit, but the land is still in possession of the complainant.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that thrust of the allegation of committing fraudulent act is against Jageshwar Pandit, but since petitioners are sons of Jageshwar Pandit, as such, they have also roped in the case with a view to coerce Jageshwar Pandit into submission.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions and taking into the consideration the fact that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their



arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, are directed to be released on anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned S.D.J.M., Banka in connection with Complaint Case No.1122 of 2023, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

