

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62757 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1141 Year-2023 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE
District- Rohtas

=====

Mithlesh Kumar Patel S/o Ram Jaggi Rawat Resident of Village
-Karamdihari, PS- Sasaram, Distt.- Rohatas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kumar Ritesh Ranjan S/o Sri Bihari Prasad R/o Mohalla - Gopalganj,
Gaurakshni Sasaram, P.S.- Sasaram Town, Distt.- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Chhote Lal Mishra, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Madan Kumar, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Saurabh Raj, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 10-12-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No.1141 of 2023 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 467 of the Indian Penal Code, lodged by the complainant Kumar Ritesh Ranjan.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant alleged that the accused petitioner offered a piece of land for Rs.7 Lakhs per kattha. The complainant wanted it to be reduced to Rs.6.5 Lakhs which was accepted by the accused



persons. Accordingly, from 09.01.2022 till 01.05.2022 payments to the tune of Rs. 10,40,000/- was made. However, when he came to know that they are not going to execute the land upon demand of money, the same was refused. This followed the legal notice and the complaint.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits out of Rs.10,40,000/-, Rs.3,00,000/- has already been returned. Further, there was no such land agreement, he had taken a loan to the tune of Rs.6,50,000/- and not Rs.10,40,000/- and has already shown his bonafide by making payment of Rs.3,00,000/-.

5. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the complainant and learned counsel has taken this Court to the document on record (Annexure-A) to show that the petitioner under his own hand writing has recorded the receipt of money which comes to the tune of Rs.10,40,000/-.

6. Upon query, whether he dispute the signature, there is no answer from the learned counsel for the petitioner, on the one hand, the petitioner's case is that no such land details were discussed.

7. Allegation is there, he agrees to the fact that certain amount has been taken and the allegation is that it has



not been returned. Clearly, the petitioner conspired to cheat in the matter to usurp the amount. In that background, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner seek bail.

8. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

