

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12506 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-95 Year-2015 Thana- CHHATAPUR District- Supaul

-
1. Chandan Kumar Thakur S/o- Mahendra Thakur R/v- Chandpur Ps- Falka Dist- Katihar.
 2. Raj Kumar Mishra S/o- Late Vanshidar Mishra R/v- Shankarpur Ps- Bhargama Dist- Araria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sri Ashok Pandey S/o- Sri Rameshwar Pandey R/v- Chhtapur Ps- Chhatapur Dist- Supaul.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramesh Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Ahmad Ali, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Md. Anwar, Advocate.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.2.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Chhatapur P.S. Case No.95 of 2015 instituted under Sections 406, 420, 120(B) of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant who is performing business of public transportation purchased a Marcopolo Bus from petitioner no.1 for the consideration amount of Rs.12,50,000/- and total Rs.5,50,000/- was handed over to petitioner no.1 after preparing an agreement. As per the



term of agreement, the complainant/ informant paid total Rs.2,71,500/- of the rest installment amount to the financier of petitioner no.1 as the said bus purchased on monthly installment by petitioner no.1. It is further alleged that petitioner no.2 who is father-in-law of petitioner no.1 was appointed as driver of the said vehicle who went to purnea with his vehicle and did not return, therefore, he informed the local police. During course of search, the informant came to know that the said vehicle was sold out to someone outside the Bihar.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that there is inordinate delay in filing the complaint which was converted into F.I.R., without any plausible explanation. Leaned counsel submits that the dispute is related to the payment with respect sale and purchase of bus in question, which is purely civil in nature. He further submits that a compromise was taken place between the parties and in support of the same, he has filed on record a copy of the compromise petition. Learned counsel submits that petitioner no.1 has got clean antecedent and petitioner no.2 has two criminal antecedents, in which he is on bail and they undertake to cooperate in the investigation and trial of the case.



5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 have oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 submits that no compromise taken place between the parties, as alleged.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of learned counsel for the parties and the nature of allegation leveled against the petitioners, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within six weeks from today, the petitioners be released on bail upon furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount to each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M.-V, Supaul/ concerned Court in connection with Chhatapur P.S. Case No.95 of 2015, subject to the conditions laid down in Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

