

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1984 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1364 Year-2015 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE
District- Rohtas

=====

Rajendra Chaudhari @ Rajendra Singh S/O Late Ashmuni Choudhary R/O
Vill. - Patadhi, P.S- Shiv Sagar, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Triveni Bhagat S/O Sri Krishna Bhagat R/O Vill. - Bilari, P.O - Silari,P.S-
Karahgar, Dist- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jharkhandi Upadhyay

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 13-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case arises out of complaint case
wherein it has been stated that the petitioner along with other
co-accused persons had opened centre for Basmati Paddy. It is
further alleged that the complainant delivered 92.43 quintals of
Basmati Paddy and in view of the same one Niladri Gupta
issued a cheque of Rs.2,03,346/- in favour of the complainant
but the same got bounced due to insufficiency of funds.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner denies that he was running any Basmati Paddy centre rather co-accused, namely, Niladri Gupta and others were involved in the business of sale and purchase of paddy from the farmers and they had stored the same in the State warehouse on rental basis under the supervision of Canara Bank, Sasaram. It is thus submitted by Learned counsel for the petitioner that the said Canara Bank was the real custodian of the stored paddy and further the cheque in question was not issued by the petitioner as would be evident from the complaint itself. In such view of the matter no case under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code is made out against him. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in case of identical nature, the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Cr. Misc. No.2425 of 2025 and in several other cases of identical nature the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate Bench of this Court as would be evident from Annexure-3 Series to the present petition. No doubt, the petitioner has a long list of criminal antecedents but all these cases are arising out of same transaction and is being filed by different farmers. As and when the petitioner gets to know of a case being filed against him or cognizance having been taken against him, he approaches the



Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned APP for the State opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned lower Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No.1364 of 2015, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C/482 (2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

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

