

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9824 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-475 Year-2025 Thana- GOPALGANJ TOWN District-
Gopalganj

=====

Anand Srivastava S/o Late Hem Chandra Srivastava Resident of Village -
Kishunpura, P.S - Lakari Nabibganj (Madarpur), District - Siwan
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar
... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Akhileshwar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Kumar Harshwardhan, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 23-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Gopalganj P.S. Case No. 475 of 2025 instituted under Sections 318(2) and 3/5 of the Bhartiya Nayay Sanhita, 2023 lodged on 22.06.2025 by the informant, Abhisekh Shankar Sahi.

3. As per the FIR, the informant alleged that for the construction of FCI godown, a contract of Rs. 7.5 crore was made out and in the process, in the year 2023, Rs.75,00,000/- was transferred. Further allegation is that altogether Rs.7.46 crore was deposited in the account of the petitioner. However, he chose to slow the construction and finally stopped and wanted Rs.50,00,000/- further. Accordingly, he paid Rs.18,00,000/- on 19.11.2024 but thereafter, he stopped even picking up the phones. This followed another transfer of Rs.15,0000/- through his brother but finally they came to the



conclusion that the petitioner has duped the amount which followed the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they have completed the work but only to harass, the present FIR. He however, accepts that the petitioner has criminal antecedent of the same nature.

5. The informant is appearing in this case and he submits that not only the petitioner has criminal antecedent of the same nature, in fact, he stands convicted in the Court of Metropolitan Magistrate, 06th, Mazgaon, Mumbai under section 138 read with 141 of the Negotiable Instrument Act, 1881, a fact which has not been brought on record in para-03. He has provided the copy of the order dated 04.01.2018. The petitioner stands convicted in connection with Case No. 1347/SS/2016.

6. Considering the allegation that has come coupled with the fact that there is suppression of fact regarding his conviction, in that background, this Court is not inclined to extend him the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

