

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12066 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-829 Year-2022 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

1. Sudheer Kumar @ Sudheer Paswan Son of Late Naresh Paswan Resident of Dariyapur, Sabji Bag, Police Station - Pirbahore, District-Patna.
2. Shubankar Raj @ Shubhanker Raj Son of Rajendra Mishra R/o B-306, Expression Exotica, Gola Raod, P.S. - Rupaspur, Dist. - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rajesh Ranjan
		Mr. Himanshu Ranjan
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Uday Pratap Singh
For the informant	:	Mrs. Aditi Medha (in person)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-04-2026

1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 829 of 2022 (G.R. No. 2047 / 2022) dated 28.08.2022 registered under Section 341, 323, 307, 354D, 506, 34 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the F.I.R. on 26.08.2022 at 06:30 P.M. when the informant was returning towards her home, then all the accused persons including the petitioners intercepted her and threatened her, to which she resisted, but the petitioners tried to pull her inside the car. It is further alleged that the informant



was somehow rescued by her family members but all the accused persons slapped and abused her. When the informant again resisted, then the petitioners started dragging her inside the vehicle by pressing her neck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He further submits that from bare perusal of the F.I.R. it is evident that the incident took place on 26.08.2022 but the F.I.R. was registered on 28.08.2022 after an inordinate delay of two days for which no plausible explanation has been given by the informant. The informant has not disclosed any motive behind the alleged occurrence. The petitioner no. 1 is an employee of M/s Expression Buildtech Pvt. Ltd. and the petitioner no. 2 is the Director of the aforesaid company.

5. The informant is one of the residents of Expression Exotica, a multistoried residential cum commercial apartment in Gola Road. The informant and her husband purchased Flat No. A-501 in the said residential complex vide registered sale deed dated 12.05.2022 and as per the terms of the sale deed as well as regulations made by the Apartment Owners Association every flat owner is required to pay maintenance charge for the



amenities availed by him however the informant and her husband refused to pay such charges which led to dispute between the parties.

6. The informant and her husband filed Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 498 / 2022 registered under Section 341, 323, 420, 385, 307, 504, 506, 120(B) of the I.P.C. against the uncle of the petitioner no. 2. The husband of the informant filed Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 572 / 2022 for offence under Section 385, 504, 506 / 34 of the I.P.C. against the petitioner no. 1 and others. The present informant filed Complaint Case No. 441 / 2023 before the C.J.M., Supaul against petitioner no. 1, his uncle, brother and one of the relatives namely Raj Bharti. The informant thereafter filed Complaint Case No. 1066(C) / 2025 before ACJM-I, Danapur against Mithlesh Kumar i.e. uncle of the petitioner no. 2 and Mrs. Pallav Jha i.e. Secretary of the Resident Association stating therein that they have again demanded maintenance from her and when she denied she was threatened by them. The informant has also instituted Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 428 / 2023 under Section 341, 323, 354B, 504, 506, 509 / 34 of the I.P.C. against some of the residents of the apartment who resented the non payment of maintenance amount by the informant. Thus, it is very much clear that the



informant and her husband are in the habit of making abuse of the process of the court in order to harass and pressurize the petitioners and others who refuse to follow their dictates inasmuch as they have already filed six cases including the present one against the petitioners and their relatives.

7. On the other hand, the informant (in person) has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that from perusal of the order refusing anticipatory bail passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Supaul in A.B.A. No. 1618 / 2025 it has come that cognizance of offence under Section 341, 323, 324, 354, 506 / 34 of the I.P.C. has already been taken against the petitioners.

8. Regard being had to the submission made by the parties, taking into consideration the nature of allegation, the fact that there is previous dispute relating to payment of maintenance charge for the amenities availed by the flat owner, the informant and her husband have filed multiple cases , accordingly, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. Let the petitioners, above named, be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from today on



furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (rupees ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Supaul in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 829 of 2022 subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the B.N.S.S. 2023.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

