

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26495 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-58 Year-2026 Thana- Bhararhi District- Madhepura

Lalan Kumar S/O Dayanand Yadav R/O Vill.- Manikpur, Ward no. 1, P.S.-
Bharrahi, Dist.- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Amrit Anand, Advocate Mr. Sailesh Kumar, Advocate Mr. Dinesh Pd. Verma, Advocate Mr. Satya Veer, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Nirmala Kumari
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Rajiv Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Deepak Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P
for the State and learned counsel appearing for the Opposite Party
No.2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered
under Sections 316 (2), 318 (4), 352, 351 (2) and 3 of B.N.S.

3. The allegation in the First Information Report is that
the petitioner is a land broker and he with connivance of other co-
accused Navin Kumar, prepared a forged document (*panchnama*).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it
would be evident from the First Information Report itself that the
dispute with regard to the plot of land is amongst the family of the
informant and although there is a general allegation of conspiracy



attached to all the accused persons including the present petitioner, the thrust of the allegation is actually against the co-accused Navin Kumar and Babita Devi who are the son and the daughter-in-law of the informant. The sale deed enclosed along with the First Information Report also indicates the names of the vendor and the vendee who are the said Navin Kumar and Babita Devi. On the said document, the present petitioner has put his signature and thumb impression merely as a witness. It is further submitted that the dispute dates back to the *panchnama* which was prepared between the parties which is of the year 2018 and the allegation upon this petitioner was that he was also instrumental in getting some forged signatures on the said *panchnama* which is of the year 2018. However, subsequent to the same, proceedings went on before the S.D.O, Madhepura and also before the D.C.L.R and the orders were passed in favour of accused Babita Devi vide orders dated 22.07.2025 and 17.02.2026 and the other contesting parties is the husband of the informant and other family members. It is further submitted that the present FIR has been lodged on 20.02.2026, subsequent to both the proceedings. It is further submitted that, in any view of the matter, the litigation is within the family of the informant and the petitioner is an outsider and has nothing to do with the affairs of the family and is merely a signatory to the sale deed.

5. Learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for



the informant have vehemently opposed the present anticipatory bail application. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the informant that the name of this petitioner has been taken along with other accused persons with the allegation of conspiracy in preparing the forged *panchnama* document. It has also been pointed out that the anticipatory bail application of two of the other co-accused persons Navin Kumar and Babita Devi have already been rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 22.04.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 26635 of 2026.

6. Taking the rival contention into consideration, it appears that the anticipatory bail plea rejected by the co-ordinate Bench relates primarily to the conduct of the son vis-a-vis his mother and on this score alone, the anticipatory bail application has been rejected. So far as the present petitioner is concerned, his case is distinguishable from the case of the other co-accused persons as he is neither family member nor any one related to the family of the informant. In such view of the matter, let the petitioner who has no criminal antecedent and no other documents indicating his signature but for the sale deed in which he has signed as a witness, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Bharrahi P.S. Case No. 58 of 2026 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the



case is pending subject to the condition laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S, 2023, subject to the condition(s):-

(i) However, the petitioner is directed to co-operate in the investigation and subsequently in the trial and in case the petitioner does not co-operate either in the investigation or subsequently in the trial the prosecution would be at liberty to file an application to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

vashudha/-

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

