

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18960 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-249 Year-2025 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

Shriman Narayan S/O Nirmal Singh @ Nirmal Kumar Sharma R/O Village-
Kinari, P.S.- Salarpur, P.S.- Jahanabad, Dist.- Jehanabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shashi Shekhar Saroj S/O Late Radhaballabh Rakesh R/O Village- Kinari,
P.O.- Salarpur, P.S.- Jahanabad, Dist.- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 06-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2),
318(4) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that on 14.02.2025, he entered into an agreement for sale with
Rajesh for purchasing a piece of land at the instance of the
petitioner, the money was paid in cash and by bank transfer, but
in the sale deed the amount entered was less than what was
given, the sale deed recorded incorrect boundaries, after



execution of the sale deed boundary was constructed, but after four years the boundary was demolished on the pretext that boundary was incorrect, thus, alleges that cheating was resorted to by the accused persons and earlier petitioner in similar manner had cheated Ramakant Pandey.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that since Rajesh was known to the petitioner and Rajesh intended to sell a piece of land, as such, petitioner introduced the informant to Rajesh and thereafter some amount was credited in the account of the petitioner by the informant for giving to Rajesh and Rajesh after receiving the amount executed the sale deed in favour of the informant. It is next submitted that the informant does not dispute the sale of land but then alleges that the boundaries in the sale deed were incorrectly recorded and, thus, after four years, the accused persons, excluding the petitioner, came and demolished the boundary wall. It is also submitted that it was not the petitioner who was involved in demolition of the boundary wall of the informant over his purchased land.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant



opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but then are not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner merely introduced the informant with Rajesh who intended to sell a piece of land and Rajesh after receiving the entire consideration executed the sale deed and the petitioner cannot be faulted if the boundary in the sale deed was incorrectly recorded.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Phulwari Sharif (Janipur) P.S. Case No. 249 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

