

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21045 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-152 Year-2018 Thana- INDUSTRIAL AREA District- Vaishali

Chandra Shekhar Pandey @ Chand Shekhar Pandey Son of Late Satrudhan Pandey Resident of Village - Maheshwarpur, P.S. - Raja Pakar, (Old Baidpur), Dist. - Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Subodh Kumar

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Industrial Area PS Case No. 152 of 2018, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of four cases and is in custody since 21-12-2025 and the informant alleges that petitioner along with four named accused persons are Directors and Employees of Armorsiya Buildcon Private Limited having office at Hajipur and the Firm advertised an advertisement of developing a site, the informant approached the Firm being impressed for



purchasing a site and the consideration fixed was Rs. 16,51,000/- as such the informant deposited an amount of Rs. 8,26,000/- and also paid an amount of Rs. 5 lakh in cash to Shashi during demonetisation at Pune, but no receiving was given and after the informant returned from Puna to Hajipur, it was found that the Firm had shut and no development of the site advertised was done and the accused persons in similar manner had taken money from different purchasers and misappropriated the same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being one of the Directors of the Company. It is next submitted that from perusal of the Annexure-2 of the anticipatory bail application, it would manifest that the same is a sale deed, which was recorded in the name of the informant by Chandra Deep, the land owner, with whom the petitioner had entered into an agreement for developing the site. It is also submitted that the land was directly recorded in the name of the informant through Chandra Deep, but then the instant false case came to be instituted. It is further submitted that one of the accused, Rakesh Kumar Tiwary, an employee of the Company, had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr.



Misc No. 42308 of 2021 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 9-5-2022 by the then learned Co-ordinate Bench.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that petitioner appears to be a fraud. It is next submitted that petitioner had earlier moved this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc No. 297 of 2023 in which by order dated 7-8-2023 direction was issued for issuing notice on the informant, but then the petitioner for reasons best known did not file a notice, as such Cr. Misc No. 297 of 2023 came to be dismissed for non-compliance of the peremptory order dated 7-8-2023. It is further submitted that from 7-8-2023 till 20-12-2025, the petitioner remained absconding despite being aware that his anticipatory bail has been dismissed for non-compliance of the peremptory order. It is also submitted that though the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner had taken a plea that petitioner got the land in favour of the informant executed through Chandra Deep with whom he had entered into an agreement, but then the sale deed is of the year 2015 and the instant FIR came to be instituted in the Year 2018. It is next submitted that if what has been submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner was a true fact in that event



notices in compliance of the order dated 7-8-2023 would have been filed so that the informant could have appeared and rebutted or accepted his claim. It is further submitted that Rakesh Kumar Tiwary, who was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by the then learned Co-ordinate Bench, was an employee and not a Director. It is also submitted that of late in the State of Bihar such private entities have sprung up in large number and are cheating people of their hard earned money. It is reiterated and submitted that the conduct of the petitioner dis-entitles him from the privilege of regular bail. It is next submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will abscond as he has antecedent of four cases.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

