

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15815 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-106 Year-2025 Thana- MADHEPURA COMPALINT CASE
District- Madhepura

=====

Vivekanand Singh @ Baban Singh S/O Jang Bahadur Singh @ Bhagwan Singh R/O Village Sakhua Dinapatti, Ward No. 10, PS - Murliganj, District- Madhepura, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mr. Niraj Kumar Singh S/O Late Kedar Prasad Singh R/O Sukhasan Chakla, Ward No. 08, PS - Madhepura, Distt. - Madhepura

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 14-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 318(4) of the BNS.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant with an allegation that petitioner dishonestly induced the complainant to part with Rs.11,85,000/- by way of consideration for getting a plot of land for the complainant but



the complainant neither got a plot of land nor the petitioner returned the amount. It is further submitted that the learned Magistrate, based on the complaint and evidences which came, took cognizance of offence under Section 318(4) of the BNS and thereafter summons were issued.

4. At this stage, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. for the State submits that from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that cognizance in the case has been taken, hence, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest and, thus, has moved before this Court seeking anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that after cognizance is taken, summons are issued and if petitioner based on the summons appears before the learned trial court, the petitioner will not be arrested, rather will join the proceedings before the learned trial court.

5. Learned A.P.P. next submits that Hon'ble Jharkhand High Court in A.B.A. No. 2319 of 2025 (Om Prakash Chhawnika @ Om Prakash Chabnika @ Om Prakash Chawnika Vs. The State of Jharkhand & Anr.) had rejected the anticipatory bail of Om Prakash Chhawnika @ Om Prakash Chabnika @ Om Prakash Chawnika in connection with Complaint Case No. 6181 of 2021 whereby cognizance was taken under Sections 323,



420, 467, 468, 471, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code. It is also submitted that cognizance in Complaint Case No. 6181 of 2021 was taken under non-bailable sections, as such, Om Prakash Chhawnika fearing arrest moved the Hon'ble Jharkhand High Court, but then his anticipatory bail came to be rejected. Thereafter, Om Prakash Chhawnika moved before the Hon'ble Supreme Court by filing SLA (Crl.) No. 16221 of 2025 assailing the order of the Hon'ble Jharkhand High Court dated 04.07.2025 in A.B.A. No. 2319 of 2025 arising out of Complaint Case No. 6181 of 2021. It is further submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court after discussing the case laws on the issue recorded at para-7 of the order dated 23.04.2026 in SLA (Crl.) No. 16221 of 2025--

“We have noticed that there is a serious problem in two States, viz. the State of Bihar and State of Jharkhand, respectively. We fail to understand that in a private complaint how does the Police involve itself or is concerned, in any manner. What was the basis for the accused to express apprehension that the police would arrest them.”,

Thereafter at para-8, it is recorded --

“In a private complaint when cognizance is taken and process is issued all that the Court would do is to issue summons. We have explained many times in the past the purport of Section 87 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (for short, “the Cr.PC.”). The Section 87 of the Cr.P.C. reads thus:-



“87. Issue of warrant in lieu of, or in addition to, summons.—A Court may, in any case in which it is empowered by this Code to issue a summons for the appearance of any person, issue, after recording its reasons in writing, a warrant for his arrest—

(a) if, either before the issue of such summons, or after the issue of the same but before the time fixed for his appearance, the Court sees reason to believe that he has absconded or will not obey the summons; or

(b) if at such time he fails to appear and the summons is proved to have been duly served in time to admit of his appearing in accordance therewith and no reasonable excuse is offered for such failure.”

At para-9, it is recorded --

“Section 87 empowers the Court to issue warrant in lieu of, or in addition to, summons. However, this power has to be exercised only in two contingencies as explained by the provision itself, i.e, (a) and (b) referred to above respectively.”

It is further submitted that at para-10, it is recorded--

“Once the Court takes cognizance and issues summons, all that the accused has to do is to appear before that Court and join the proceedings. Why should the accused go before the Sessions Court or the High Court, as the case may be, and pray for anticipatory bail? Police has no power to arrest the accused in a complaint case unless there is a non bailable warrant issued by that Court along with the summons.”

6. At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that no doubt the law on the issue is



clear as decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court but then in practice in the State of Bihar, the learned Magistrate in a mechanical manner on appearance of the accused based on summons, relegate them to judicial custody, on which learned A.P.P. submits that it is difficult to appreciate what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as it cannot be presumed that the learned Magistrate will not appreciate the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant also is not in a position to rebut the submissions made by learned A.P.P. for the State.

8. At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner fairly submits that since only summons have been issued in the case, as such, in view of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 23.04.2026 in SLA (Crl.) No. 16221 of 2025, the instant anticipatory bail application is not maintainable at this stage, hence, seeks permission to withdraw the anticipatory bail application and submits that the petitioner will appear before the learned trial court and will join the proceedings. It is further submitted that the learned Magistrate also has to take note of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court,



on which learned A.P.P. submits that it is the duty of the petitioner to ensure that the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is also produced at the time when the petitioner appears before the learned trial court.

9. Since the petitioner has prayed for withdrawing the anticipatory bail application at this stage, as such, permission is accorded and the anticipatory bail application is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to appear before the learned trial court with an order dated 23.04.2026 in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 16221 of 2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

10. At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that till date non-bailable warrant of arrest has not been issued against the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

