

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75832 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-365 Year-2024 Thana- SIWAN MUFFASIL District- Siwan

1. Rama Shankar Manjhi S/o- Dahari Manjhi Village- Salempur Mahadewa, P.S.- siwan, District- Siwan
2. Pranjali Kumar @ Pranjali Kumar S/O- Rama Shankar Manjhi Village- Salempur Mahadewa, P.S.- Siwan Muffasil, District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Chandra Shekhar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Satyendra Narayan Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 18-01-2025 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 420, 471, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that informant, who is retired teacher, on 09.02.2024 purchased a land measuring 15 dhurs appertaining to Khata No. 29, Plot No. 105 from Petitioner No. 1 upon payment of consideration money amounting to Rs. 22,00,000/- in cash and co-accused Devendra Kumar was the identifier and Petitioner No. 2 is the witness of the deed. It is alleged that after some time of execution of the



sale deed, some dispute arose and when the informant went to meet the accused persons, they denied. On query, informant got information that a title suit bearing T.S. No. 300 of 2017 is pending with regard to the land in question. Thereafter, the informant requested the accused persons to return the money but they refused.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that Petitioner No. 2 is witness and Petitioner No. 1 was broker of the land in question and was in exclusive possession of the land at the time of execution of the sale deed. Petitioners are not the beneficiaries. They are neither vendor nor vendee. He further submits that the dispute is civil in nature relating to sale and purchase of land and as such, no criminal offence is made out against these petitioners. Petitioners claim clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. and there is specific accusation that after taking Rs. 22,00,000/- in cash they executed sale deed of a dispute land in favour of the informant.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



and nature of accusation, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail
to the petitioners is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

