

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73262 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1641 Year-2023 Thana- BEGUSARAI COMPLAINT CASE
District- Begusarai

Chandra Shekhar Singh S/O NA R/O At and P.O.- Simaria, Near Simaria
Station, P.S.- Barauni, Dist.- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Siddhartha Prasad, Advocate Mr. Om Prakash Kumar, Advocate Ms. Swetang Sinha, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Pushpa Sinha, A.P.P.
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate Mr. Utsav Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 323, 504, 506 and 427/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that inadvertently, at para 3 of the anticipatory bail application, it has been pleaded that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent, when he has antecedent of one case under the NI Act but then the same has been stayed by this Court. It is further submitted that the complainant alleges that he entered into a partnership with the petitioner and invested in the partnership firm, namely, M/S



Rashtrakavi Dinkar Indane Gramin Vitrak. Further, the partnership deed was registered on 15.04.2013 and, during the course of business, two trucks and a pickup vehicle were purchased in the name of the firm and installment was being paid from the income of the firms. Further, in between 2018-2022, the complainant transferred an amount of Rs.11 lakhs to the account of the firms, however, since April 2023, the petitioner took all the account of the firms record from office to his residence and denied the complainant any access to the records which led to service of legal notice and the issue was tried to be resolved through Panchayati but failed as the petitioner and his wife denied any partnership.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the complaint, it would manifest that the dispute is purely civil to which a criminal colour has been given. It is next submitted that the complainant is alleging that he entered into a partnership agreement with the petitioner which the petitioner is denying. It is also submitted that if what is being alleged by the complainant is true in that event the complainant ought to have approached a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the dispute adjudicated but then the instant criminal case has been instituted only with a view to coerce the petitioner



into submission so that the petitioner under fear of arrest parts with the fanciful demand of the complainant.

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 petitioner but then are not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the complainant ought to have approached a court of competent civil jurisdiction to get the dispute adjudicated.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his 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 One Thousand) 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. 1641 of 2023, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

