

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1792 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-72 Year-2025 Thana- LAUHIYANAGAR District- Begusarai

Ramashray Sahni S/o Dinesh Sahni R/o Village - Maladih, Ward no. 6, P.S -
Birpur, District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Randhir Kumar No 1, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Prem Kumar Jha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 27-04-2026 1. 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 318(4) and
316(2) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that he is proprietor of Maa Urmila Traders and sells
sand and *Gitti*, further on 27.06.2025 Vikash called the
informant on his mobile from his Mobile No. 9570755713 and
said that he intends to purchase sand and *Gitti* and the
consideration fixed was Rs. 1,22,300/- and the sand and *Gitti*
was to be delivered at Mausami enterprises, accordingly the
articles were delivered by truck to Ramashray and Vikash got



the money from customer on PhonePe, but did not pay the informant, thus, alleges that Vikash cheated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that thrust of the allegation is against Vikash. It is also submitted that even informant alleges that Ramashray, after accepting the sand and *Gitti*, had paid the amount to Vikash on PhonePe, but then Vikash did not pay the informant, as such, he misappropriated the amount. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that from perusal of Annexure-2 to the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that an amount of Rs. 41,300/- was paid in account of Gaurav Kumar, a staff of Vikash, by the petitioner. It is further submitted that petitioner only had ordered for sand and the amount was accordingly paid.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail



bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten 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 Lohiyanagar P.S. Case No. 72 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

