

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66529 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-613 Year-2022 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

-
1. Ravindra Singh @ Bhikhari Singh, Son of Late Dayanand Singh Resident of Village- Bhagwatipur, P.S. -Shahpur, District- Patna
 2. Gulshan Kumar, Son of Ravindra Singh Resident of Village- Bhagwatipur, P.S. -Shahpur, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Randhir Kumar, Son of Late Dharmendra Singh Resident of Village- Bhagwatipur, P.S. -Shahpur, District- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Satish Chandra
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms. Nirmala Kumari- A.P.P. Mr. Nitesh Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 31-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned

APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of

the complainant.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their

arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 474, 506, 120B, 34 of the

Indian Penal Code, but the cognizance has been taken under

Sections 420, 468, 471 and 506 of the I.P.C.

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

complainant, at the outset, submits that petitioner no.1 has

antecedent of one case. It is next submitted that complainant and



petitioner no.1 are agnates and they are having dispute relating to property for which Title Suit No.252 of 2022 is pending adjudication in the Court of the learned Sub-Judge-1, Danapur, Patna. It is next submitted that petitioner no.1 does not have any share in the property, but still he sold the land to one Uday Kumar. It is next submitted that Uday Kumar is a criminal having antecedent of six cases and the land was sold to him only for the reason to coerce the complainant into submission as complainant would not be in a position to recover the land even after the Title Suit is decided in his favour from Uday Kumar. It is submitted that Uday Kumar had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail application by filing Cr. Misc. No.68020 of 2024 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 18.12.2024.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners vehemently rebuts the said submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant. It is submitted that petitioner no.1 and complainant, no doubt, are agnates and are having dispute relating to property and the land which petitioner no.1 sold to Uday Kumar is his land. It is also submitted that submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant that the land does not belong to petitioner no.1 has been made only



to prejudice the Court. It is also submitted that in the Title Suit, it will be decided whether the land belongs to the petitioner no.1 or the complainant, but then, is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant that the purchaser of the land from petitioner no.1 carries antecedent of six cases.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner no.2 is son of petitioner no.1 and he is a mere witness on the sale deed. It is further submitted that being son he obeyed the orders of his father.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, at this stage, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application with respect to petitioner no.1 Ravindra Singh @ Bhikhari Singh.

7. Permission is accorded.

8. Accordingly, instant petition is dismissed as withdrawn with respect to petitioner no.1, Ravindra Singh @ Bhikhari Singh.

9. So far as petitioner no.2 Gulshan Kumar is concerned, the petitioner no.2, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on anticipatory



bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/-
(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount
each to the satisfaction of Mr. Vishudha Prakash, the learned
JMFC, Danapur, Patna in connection with Complaint Case
No.613(C) of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under
Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

10. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

