

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3666 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-985 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Abhishek Kumar Singh Son of Dipnarayan Singh Resident of Postal Park,
Road No. 5 A, Indra Nagar, Ram Vilas Chowk, Near Shiv Parvati Community
Hall, Post- G.P.O., P.S.- Jakkanpur, District- Patna, Bihar, Permanent
Address- Village and Post- Chanda Kevatia, P.S.- Bihiya, District- Bhojpur,
Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kumari Puja D/O- Bhanu Pratap Singh Resident of opposite JKMT Inter
High School, Mahatma Gandhi Marg, Ward No. 21, Khagaria, P.O. and P.S.-
Khagaria, District- Khagaria, Current Address Purani Bus Stand, Mithapur,
P.S.- Jakkanpur, District- Patna, Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pranoy Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

6 07-05-2026 Heard Mr.Pranoy Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and the Mr.Shailendra Kumar, learned A.P.P. for

the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, who is in custody
since 19.08.2025 in connection with Complaint Case No.
985(C) 2023, cognizance has been taken for the offences
under Section 406 of IPC & 138 N.I. Act.

3. As per FIR, complainant has given more than
Rs. 20,00,000/- (Twenty Lakh) rupees as a friendly loan to
the petitioner and his brother for the purpose of their



business and marriage of their sister on different dates. An agreement was also executed between them but despite several requests petitioner is not returning the money to the complainant. Petitioner has used the money of the complainant for his own business.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. It appears from the FIR/Complaint petition that the petitioner has given undertaking to the complainant, pursuant to the agreement dated 25.09.2021.

5. Learned counsel for the informant/complainant submits that despite of that the petitioner has not given a single penny of a coin to the complainant and he has issued two cheques in favour of the complainant i.e. Cheque Nos. 590533 dated 21.11.2022 and 590541 dated 28.02.2022 respectively to a tune of Rs. 20,00,00/- (Twenty Lakhs) and Rs.5,00,000/- (Five Lakhs) respectively but the same were dishonoured by the bank concerned due to mismatch the signature of the petitioner.



6. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in turn, submits that due to some business term the petitioner has given the cheque in question to the complainant and complainant has misused the same.

7. Learned counsel for the informant/complainant has filed a counter affidavit stating therein that he has never any business term with the petitioner.

8. In turn, learned counsel for the petitioner has filed the reply to the counter affidavit stating therein that due to marriage purpose, the petitioner has given the cheque in question to the complainant which suggests that the petitioner has changed his story by way of reply to the counter affidavit.

9. Learned counsel for the informant/complainant further submits that even the complainant is ready to receive the amount by installment from the petitioner but the learned counsel for the petitioner, on instruction, submits that the petitioner is not ready to pay a single penny of a coin.

10. In view of the aforesaid, this Court has no other option except to reject the bail application of the



petitioner, accordingly, I am not inclined to enlarge the
petitioner on bail in connection with Complaint Case No.
985(C) 2023, pending in the court of learned ACJM-XI,
Patna.

11. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

