

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13220 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-68 Year-2023 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Supaul

Prabhat Kumar Jha @ Parwat Kumar Jha S/O Shri Arun Jha R/O Village-
Ekma, Ward No. 15, P.S- Supaul, Distt.- Supaul, Pin Code- 841208.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vishnu Deo Mandal S/O Late Ramadhin Mandal R/O Village- Shakin
Gadiya, P.S- Pipra, Distt.- Supaul, Pin Code- 852218.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Purushottam Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

4 24-06-2026 Heard Mr. Purushottam Kumar, learned counsel for

the petitioner, the State as also Mrs. Pratibha Srivastava for the

complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Complaint Case No. 68C/2023 for the offence registered
under sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the complaint, the petitioner approached the
complainant and informed that he is interested in the land of the
complainant and the amount (Rs. 65,00,000/-) can be paid by
transfer of land vide sale deed no. 8820 and 8821 both dated
31.12.2022. The further contention is that the land of the
petitioner was fixed at Rs. 65,00,000/- for which the land which



got transferred to him was worth Rs. 45,00,000/- and it was agreed that the rest of the 20,00,000/- plus the expenses in the registry work will come to Rs. 30,00,000/- which will be paid in installment.

4. However, when he went to take possession of the land, the care-taker of one of the executor, Ranjeet Kumar Chaudhary informed that the land owner resides in Delhi and has not visited the State of Bihar.

5. The complainant had a telephonic conversation with Ranjeet Kumar Chaudhary who immediately returned to Bihar and then informed that documents were given to this petitioner earlier as he was interested in selling the land which has been misused by him. As the complainant tried to contact him, it came to knowledge that he along with his wife has already left for Nepal.

6. Feeling cheated, the complaint.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he executed sale deed only with regard to Sale Deed No. 8820 and not 8821 where he is a mere witness.

8. Mrs. Pratibha Srivastava, learned counsel representing the complainant on the other hand submits that both the sale deed no. 8820 and 8821 dated 31.12.2022 were



handed over to the complainant which according to the parties were worth Rs. 45,00,000/- and as such, he cannot escape after making submission that the sale deed no. 8821 is not related to the present case. In fact, he has cheated both Ranjeet Kumar Chaudhary as also the complainant and in the process, valuable land of his got transferred.

9. Having gone through the facts of the case and the materials on record and the story that unfolded, as recorded above, certainly, this is not a fit case where relief can be extended to the petitioner.

10. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Vijay Singh/-

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

