

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18695 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-327 Year-2025 Thana- NAGAR District- Vaishali

Shailesh Kumar Singh S/o Rambahal Singh RO Village- Hela Bazar, PS-
Hajipur Town, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Himanshu Ranjan Mr. Sudhanshu Prakash Mr. Manish Chandra Gandhi
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Bharat Lal- A.P.P. Mr. Binod Murari Mishra Mr. Prem Kumar Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Sharma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of
the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Hajipur Town P. S. Case No.327 of 2025 registered for
the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 338,
336(2), 340(2), 61(2) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of twenty cases and the same is
rebutted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
informant and it is submitted that petitioner has antecedent of
twenty one cases. The learned counsel for the petitioner next



submits that the informant alleges that petitioner in connivance with Mithilesh and Rakesh sold his ancestral land to various purchasers based on forged power of attorney when power of attorney in favour of Mithilesh and Rakesh was cancelled earlier. Further, accused were also helped in their misdeeds by the Registry Office and the Circle Office, Hajipur. It is next alleged that petitioner in name of his wife also got a lease with respect to the disputed land executed. Further, when informant requested his uncle Mithilesh to get the sale deed cancelled, his named cousin brother abused and threatened that he will lose his life for the land and that a case under SC/ST Act would be instituted, since some purchasers belongs to SC/ST Category. It is next alleged that petitioner is a land mafia and grabs land under threat and if he is not able to grab the land by force then gets the land owner implicated in cases relating to SC/ST Act. It is next alleged that delay in instituting the FIR was because of the reason that his father was looking after the land, hence informant and his brother were not much aware of the land, but they came to know about the misdeeds of the accused persons including the petitioner when his father died on 01.12.2024 and that Shailesh had taken Munna whom his father had entrusted with the work of looking after the land in confidence.



4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the dispute is purely civil to which a criminal colour has been given. It is further submitted that if what has been alleged in the FIR is true, in that event, the informant ought to have moved a court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed cancelled, but then, instead of moving before a court of competent civil jurisdiction, the instant FIR came to be instituted only a with a view to coerce the accused persons including the petitioner into submission.

5. Learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the anticipatory bail application. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that it is difficult to countenance what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, but then, it is not that every civil dispute does not have criminal contours. It is next submitted that specific allegation has been alleged in the FIR that based on forged and fabricated documents, the land of the informant has been grabbed by the petitioner. It is next submitted that a specific



allegation is alleged that petitioner is a land mafia and the same also gets corroborated by the facts that he has antecedent of twenty one cases. It is further submitted that process under Section 84 BNSS has already been issued which amply demonstrates that petitioner is evading the law.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. as well as the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

