

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4877 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4574 Year-2022 Thana- MUZZFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

-
1. Priti Kumari W/o Kumar Gaurav Director Shiwanish Logis Presently office at Nand Vihar Colony, Bela, PS.- Mithanpura, Dist- Muzafarpur, W/o Kumar Gaurav, R/o Majhauri Pachdahi, PO- Pachdahi, PS- Bariyarpur, Dist-.Muzzafarpur, Bihar-843119
 2. Kumar Gaurav S/o Mr. Chandra Bhusan Mishra R/o Majhauri Pachdahi, PO- Pachdahi, PS- Bariyarpur, Dist-.Muzzafarpur, Bihar-843119

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Pratik Parasar S/o Late Shashibhushan Mishra R/o vill - Mahammadpur Mohan, P.S.- Sakra, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Dhananjay Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr.Ashok Kumar Singh- A.P.P.
	Mr.Pradeep Kumar Sinha
	Ms.Punam Shrivastava

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 26-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest in Muzaffarpur Complaint Case No.4574 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 138 of the N. I. Act.

3. The learned counsel for the complainant submits that the case was taken up on 12.03.2026, when one week time



was sought by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that endeavours would be made for returning the amount which was created in the account of the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the complainant further submits that an amount of Rs.20 Lacs was credited in the account of petitioner no.1 and Rs.3 Lacs in the account of petitioner no.2 by the complainant by way of advance money for purchasing a piece of land for which consideration was fixed at Rs.35 Lacs, but then, the land was sold to a different purchaser, but the amount which was credited in the account of the petitioners was not returned, as such, on 12.03.2026 time was taken.

5. Today when the case is taken up, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioners had instructed him to make submission that endeavours would be made to return the amount which was credited in their account, but as of now, despite his best endeavours, he could not contact the petitioners nor the petitioners contacted him after 12.03.2026.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



7. The prayer of the petitioners for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

