

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2425 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1307 Year-2015 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE
District- Rohtas

=====

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

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Jay Prakash Narayan Singh S/O Late Mundrika Singh R/O Village-
Mominpur, P.O- Silari, P.S- Karahgar, Distt.- Rohtas.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kalyan Shankar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 15-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case no.1307 of 2015 registered under Section
420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 138 of the N.I. Act.

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 63.96 quintals of
Basmati Paddy and in view of the same Niladri Gupta issued a
cheque of Rs. 1,40,712/- 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 has been falsely implicated in the case. The petitioner had never opened any centre for purchasing Basmati Paddy, rather co-accused Niadri Gupta and others were involved in the business of sale and purchase of paddy from the farmers and they had stored the same in a 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 several 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. The application for anticipatory bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances of the case, it is directed that the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case no.1307 of 2015 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 Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sasaram, subject to the condition laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S, 2023.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Harsh/-

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

