

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36684 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2024 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - DEHRI-ON-SONE
District- Rohtas

-
1. Pratik Kumar Singh @ Pratik Singh S/o Late Shyam Narayan Singh
Resident of Village - Civil Line Road, Tarachand Complex Robertsganj, P.S.
- Robertsganj, Dist. - Sonbhadra(U.P.)
 2. Dinesh Dubey @ Dinesh Chandra Dubey S/o Late Ram Bahal Dubey
Resident of Village - G-53 1st floor, Sohna Road, Sourth City - 2 Islampur -
97, P.S. - Islampur, Dist. - Gurgaon(Hariyana).

... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Dr. Raghwandra Deo Singh S/o Late Lakhan Deo Singh R/o Vill. - New
Dilliya Ward no. 21, P.S. - Dehri, Dist. - Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dharmendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Veerendra Narayan, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. The accused-petitioners, named in the complaint, are
apprehending their arrest in connection with Complaint Case
No. 99 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 406, 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioners is to supply the
old harvester machine to the complainant with tampered engine
and chassis number having forged sticker of the company
affixed thereon.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners



submitted that petitioners are the dealer of harvester machine, which was imported from Japan. It is pointed out that service of harvesting machine was to be done by trained and authorized persons of the company, but it was handled roughly by the complainant himself for long two years due to which certain engine related problem surfaced, whereafter in very planned and formulated manner, the present complaint was filed after passing of three years in the year 2024.

5. It is further argued that petitioners being dealer received harvester machine as booked by the complainant vide invoice dated 01.11.2021, which is at page '5' of supplementary affidavit dated 18.06.2026, and was sold to the complainant through Invoice dated 01.12.2021 issued by the firm of petitioners i.e. M/s Aparajita Automobiles. It is argued that the allegation maximum attract consumer dispute. Petitioners claimed clean antecedent.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

7. In view of the aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of the fact as complaint in issue admittedly lodged after three years of purchase of harvesting machine, coupled with the fact that petitioners are men of clean antecedent,



accordingly, both above-named petitioners, in the event of their arrest/surrender within a period of four weeks from this order, are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing of bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dehri at Rohtas/concerned court in connection with Complaint Case No. 99 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C/Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (in short “B.N.S.S.”).

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Rajeev/-

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

