

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34282 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-247 Year-2013 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

-
1. Raghuveer Prasad Yadav @ Raghubir Prasad @ Raghubir Rai S/o Mangani Rai R/o Village - Bagaha, P.S. - Ghorahasan, Dist. - East Champaran.
 2. Mukesh Rai @ Mukesh Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar Yadav S/o Raghuveer Prasad Yadav @ Raghubir Rai @ Raghubir Prasad R/o Village - Bagaha, P.S. - Ghorahasan, Dist. - East Champaran.
 3. Akhilesh Rai @ Aklesh Prasad Yadav S/o Raghuveer Prasad Yadav @ Raghubir Rai @ Raghubir Prasad R/o Village - Bagaha, P.S. - Ghorahasan, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vidya Devi W/o Ramvilas Singh R/o Village - Bagaha, P.S. - Ghorahasan, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Suraj Kumar Tiwari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-05-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 247 of 2013 registered for the offences punishable under sections 406, 323, 427, 354, 379 and 504 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the complaint case which has been lodged on the basis of the complaint made by the complainant to the effect that the petitioners have executed the sale deed of the land



of the complainant bearing Khata No. 70, Khesra No. 2998 area measuring 5^{1/2} dhurs by creating forged deed in their name through co-accused Phuljhari Devi. When they tried to take possession of the said land, the complainant protested upon which they abused and assaulted her and her son. The accused persons also snatched her gold ornaments worth Rs. 8,000/-.

4. At the outset, the learned A.P.P. for the State submits that the process under section 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. have been issued. Upon which the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that process under Section 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. have been issued, on the same date, without awaiting for any service report with regard to issuance of summons, warrants and the petitioners were not aware about the pendency of the present case.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the records, it appears that process under section 82 and 83 of the Cr.P.C. have been issued against the petitioner on 13.01.2026, therefore, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

vinita/-

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

