

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35775 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-352 Year-2025 Thana- PIPRAKOTHI District- East Champaran

Dhananjay Kumar Singh S/o Ram Anup Singh @ Ramanup Singh R/o Village
- Mathurapur, P.S - Turkauliya, District - East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Anshay Bahadur Mathur, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Rina Sinha, APP
For the informant	:	Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 26-05-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for the informant and the learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Piprakothi P.S. Case No. 352 of 2025, for allegedly having committed offences under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 3(5) of B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant, to the effect that he purchased a land bearing Khata No. 50, Khesra No. 801, measuring an area of 4 Katha 4 Dhur by a registered sale deed on 30.12.2020 from Rajnish Kumar Singh @ Puttu Singh and since then he is in possession of the said land. He further alleged that same land has been fraudulently sold by the petitioner and one



Ravi Kumar Singh to Ram Pravesh Yadav, Umesh Kumar Yadav and Raj Kumar without having any right and title.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the disputed plot of land bearing Khata No. 50, out of which, Rajnish Kumar has transferred 4 Katha 4 Dhur in favour of the informant by a registered sale deed no.10786, dated 30.12.2020, whereas from the remaining 9 Katha 17 Dhur, the petitioner along with his other co-sharer, Dhananjay Kumar Singh has executed another sale deed on 04.07.2025 for an area measuring 4 Katha 4 Dhur in favour of co-accused nos. 1, 2 and 4. The land, which has been sold by the petitioner, is different from the land, which has been mentioned by the informant. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the boundary mentioned therein is different from the sale deed, which has been executed by the informant. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there is a dispute in between the family members and due to which the present case has been filed. The informant, to put undue pressure upon the petitioner herein, has filed the present First Information Report. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has got five antecedents and all the cases have been lodged by the co-sharer of the land in question.

5. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the petitioner has sold the same land,



which was earlier sold by the informant and he further submits that the petitioner along with co-accused are indulged in capturing and grabbing different lands for which they have been named in different cases relating to land grabbing and capturing. He further submits that one of the co-accused, namely, Ravi Kumar has been put behind bars and his bail has been rejected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in one another case relating to land grabbing.

6. The learned APP appearing on behalf of the state also opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner has got five antecedents relating to land capturing and grabbing.

7. Having considered the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that there is a land dispute in between the parties and due to said dispute for sale of same plot of land, which has been alleged by the informant, the present First Informant Report has been lodged. The informant by putting pressure upon the petitioner has filed the present case to settle the civil remedy. It further appears that four co-accused, namely, Raj Kumar @ Raj Kumar Ram , Umesh Kumar Yadav, Ram Pravesh Yadav and Yogendra Rai have been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by a learned Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order 08.04.2026, passed in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 21728 of



2026.

8. Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks, be released on bail 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate, Motihari in connection with Piprakothi P.S. Case No.352 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S with a further condition that:-

The learned court concerned shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court concerned shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bond in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/Shital

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

