

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.10597 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-241 Year-2024 Thana- TILAUTHU District- Rohtas

Sudhanshu Kumar Sinha @ Sudhanshu Son of Sampat Kumar Sinha Resident of Mohalla -Santoshi Maa Path Gaurakshni PO -and PS -Sasaram District -Rohtas P/A- Residing at B-68, pandav nagar, D. Park, Ps- Mandawali, east Delhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akhouri Vipin Bihari Shrivastava, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 08-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 448, 420, 379, 354, 406/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Informant, namely, Shakuntala Devi alleged that her daughter Sanskriti was staying in Sasaram for studies where her classmate i.e. this petitioner and his cousin Aprajita assured her of a private job in Delhi. After she started working, this petitioner claimed that her cousin had cancer and demanded Rs. 10 lacs for her treatment and later, convinced informant to deposit money into Sanskriti's account promising investment return but instead withdrew Rs. 2,15,000/- using an OTP and misappropriated total amount of Rs. 20.15,793/- including cash.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. As a matter of



fact, this petitioner and the daughter of informant are friends and she had taken Rs. 12,35,000/- on different times in different accounts from the petitioner and when he demanded his money back, she herself transferred Rs. 2,25,000/- out of Rs. 12,35,000/- in the account of this petitioner. When petitioner again demanded the remaining amount, she gave cheque worth Rs. 10 lacs bearing Cheque No. 000002 dated 17.07.2024 which got bounced and thus, petitioner sent her legal notice on 8.8.2024. Petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case with a view to avoid repayment of the remaining amount. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that there is specific accusation that this petitioner cheated informant of Rs. 2,15,000/- and in support of the same, he has also placed some documentary evidence.

6. Considering the nature of accusation and materials available on record, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is refused.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

