

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29884 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2026 Thana- Mohanpur District- Purnia

1. Sarita Devi W/o- Sudhir Yadav R/v- Vijay Amannt W.No-12, Po- Dholwajja
Ps- Mohanpur Dist- Purnea
2. Ranveer Kumar S/o- Sadhu Yadav R/v- Tulsipur Ps- Kharik Dist- Bhagalpur
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Santosh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Mohanpur P.S. Case No. 09 of 2026 for the offence punishable under sections 338, 336(3), 340(2), 318(4), 3(5) of the BNS lodged on 24.01.2026 by the informant.

3. Prosecution story, in brief, is that the informant in his written report stated that on 21.10.2021, Sarita Devi (petitioner no.1) got registered sale deed no. 8671 dated 21.10.2021 at Registry Office Dhamdaha relates to the land of Khata No. 333, Plot No. 1064, area 0.25 dec, plot no. 1065 area 1.25 dec., plot no. 1066, area 0.83 dec. total area 2.33 dec., with consideration amount at Rs. 8, 30, 000/- executed by Pramod Kumar Roy (now deceased) with false signature and photograph



of his father in which the identifier is said to be the accused, Ranveer Kumar (petitioner no.2). The informant further alleged that his father did not sell any such land, and on 23.01.2026, the accused-petitioner, Sarita Devi with the help of some person tried to dispossess the informant from his land. Accordingly, the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and they have falsely been implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that the signature of the petitioners, which are said to be appended on the sale-deed having been executed on 11.10.2021 in which the petitioner no.1, namely, Sarita Devi is shown to be the vendee while petitioner no.2 is an identifier, are forged and the whole documents are false and fabricated and the petitioners are in no way connected with the said documents and further, would not derive any benefit out the such sale-deed and the informant will always be at liberty to seek cancellation of the said sale-deed, in case, he proposes to do so. It has further been stated by the counsel for the petitioners that such undertaking at the time of furnishing bail bond would be made by these petitioners which the concerned court may be directed to accept it. Lastly, it has been submitted that both the



petitioners have got fair antecedent.

5. Learned APP, on the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that if such undertakings are given by the petitioners before the concerned court at the time of furnishing bail bond, in such event, they may be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the stand taken by the petitioners that they are ready to give an undertaking at the time of furnishing bail bond that they would not derive any benefit from the said sale-deed and the informant would always be at liberty to get the same cancelled and also considering the fact that the petitioners are of clean antecedent, this Court is inclined to extend them the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Let the petitioners, above named, be released on bail in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) each with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ***Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-II, Purnea*** in connection with aforesaid PS Case, subject to the conditions that the petitioners shall give an undertaking at the time furnishing bail bond that they would not derive any benefit from the said sale-deed and the informant



would always be at liberty to get the same cancelled and as also subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bond.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

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

