

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73658 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-485 Year-2020 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

1. Anmol Yadav S/o Late Dhukhi Yadav R/o Village- Gadhiya, Ward No. 10, P.S.- Kumarkhand, District- Madhepura
2. Abhinash Kumar S/o Anmol Yadav R/o Village- Gadhiya, Ward No. 10, P.S.- Kumarkhand, District- Madhepura
3. Tuntun Yadav S/o Raghuni Yadav R/o Village- Kumarkhand, Gadhiya, Ward No. 10, P.S.- Kumarkhand, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-11-2025 Heard Mr. Santosh Kumar Singh, learned counsel
for the petitioners and Mr. Raj Kishor Singh, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Madhepura P.S. Case No. 485 of 2020, F.I.R. dated 25.06.2020 for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468 of the IPC.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant alleged that his land has been sold by one Rupesh Kumar to petitioner no. 2 on the basis of forged documents where petitioner no.1 is the witness and petitioner no. 3 is the identifier



of the deed in question.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 carries two criminal antecedents, petitioner no. 2 carries one criminal antecedent and petitioner no. 3 also carries one criminal antecedent and they all are on bail in the pending matters and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R is false and fabricated and the petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that the informant is the land broker and petitioner no. 2 has not purchased the land in question from the informant rather he has purchased the said land from one Rupesh Kumar after paying him the consideration amount and after receiving the said consideration amount the land owner (Rupesh Kumar) has executed and land in question on 29.01.2020 in favour of petitioner no. 2. Petitioner no. 1 has been made accused merely on the ground that he is the witness and petitioner no. 3 is the identifier of the said deed in question. Apart from the aforesaid, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present case is purely a civil dispute and the informant tried to convert the same into a criminal case.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has



vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances that the petitioner no. 2 has purchased the land in question from Rupesh Kumar who is owner of the said land and petitioner nos. 1 & 3 have been made accused in the present case because they are the witness and identifier, respectively, of the deed in question, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Madhepura in connection with Madhepura P.S. Case No. 485 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioners shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move



for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

