

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35636 of 2026

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

Ravi Kumar Singh @ Ravi Singh S/o Late Rajbanshi Singh R/o village -
Mathurapur, P.S.- Turkauliya, Distt.- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anshay Bahadur Mathur, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Madhurendra Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

2 01-06-2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Piprakothi P.S. Case no.352 of 2025 registered under sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that the land purchased by him from one Rajnish Kumar Nirala has been sold by the accused persons including the petitioner, thus leading to the instant FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case wherein the allegations are one of purely civil dispute. The petitioner and the vendor of the informant namely Rajnish Kumar Nirala are co-



sharers and belong to the same family between whom partition suit etc. are going on in the Court below. The matters arise out of the immovable property which are subject matter of the said partition suit. The proper remedy for the informant was to file appropriate suit in the learned Court below for cancellation of the sale deed, if any. Further referring to the statement made in paragraph no.6 of the petition which gives the description of the lands sold by the petitioner, learned counsel submits that the boundary of the land sold by the petitioner and that of the informant are distinct and different. The petitioner is in custody since 9.2.2026 and undertakes to cooperate in the investigation/trial.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that besides there being direct allegation against the petitioner, even on earlier occasion he has sold similar pieces of land belonging to others. As such, it is not a case for grant of bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the relationship of the petitioner and the vendor of the informant being co-sharers together with the nature of dispute and the petitioner having remained in custody



since 9.2.2026, the Court directs the petitioner to be enlarged on bail in connection with Piprakothi P.S. Case no.352 of 2025 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, East Champaran.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

