

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36904 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-49 Year-2020 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE - BARH District-
Patna

=====

Prema Devi W/O Anil Singh Resident of village - Sultanpur,P.S- Mokama,
Dist.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Arvind Kumar Sharma S/O Rajendra Prasad Sharma R/O Vill.- Sultanpur,
P.S- Mokamah ,Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Aryan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Anil Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 20-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf

of the complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable under Sections 120(B),

193, 420, 465 and 468 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

complainant submits that one Parmeshwar had four sons, Kamo,

Dhanik, Nawal and Siya, it is submitted that Ramanuj is son of

Kamo Singh and Anil is son of Siya, as such, Ramanuj and Anil

are own cousin brother and they reside in the same house. It is



next submitted that Prema Devi (petitioner herein) is wife of Anil Singh. It is next submitted that Anil Singh was aware of the fact that Ramanuj, his cousin brother, does not have title over the land in dispute, but still he got the land in dispute purchased in the name of his wife, Prema Devi. It is further submitted that Prema Devi, based on the sale deed executed by Ramanuj, applied for mutation before the Circle Officer which came to be rejected, thereafter, she went in appeal before the DCLR, but then the DCLR also upheld the order rejecting the mutation application of the instant petitioner. It is next submitted that concealing the order of the Circle Officer and DCLR, the petitioner again applied for mutation afresh before the Circle Officer and this time succeeded in getting the purchased land mutated in her name. It is further submitted that informant on coming to know that petitioner after concealing the earlier order of Circle officer and DCLR got the land purchased from Ramanuj mutated, accordingly, filed a revision application before the Additional Collector and the Additional Collector after examining the record came to a considered conclusion that Circle Officer had illegally mutated the purchased land in favour of the petitioner and thus the order of the Circle Officer was set aside. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant



next submits that Anil Singh despite being aware that his cousin brother, Ramanuj, does not have title over the land in dispute, still got a sale deed executed in the name of his wife i.e. petitioner and thereafter petitioner succeeded in getting the land mutated in her by concealing relevant facts, which subsequently got cancelled. It is next submitted that under a well hatched conspiracy, the sale deed was executed in favour of the petitioner, that in the event if truth comes to the fore then a plea of civil dispute will be taken, but then it is submitted that in the nature of allegation as alleged in the complaint, though, *prima facie* it appears that the dispute is civil in nature, but then it has contours of criminal conspiracy. It is also submitted that price of the land in the State of Bihar has skyrocketed, as such, forgery is being resorted to in the name of civil dispute. It is next submitted that Ramanuj upto Second Appeal before this court lost the case with regard to his title over the land and this fact was in knowledge of Anil who also resides with Ramanuj in the same house and is his cousin brother. It is also submitted that Ramanuj after executing the sale deed expired.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner vehemently rebuts the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, it is



submitted that Ramanuj executed the sale deed in favour of petitioner who is wife of Anil Singh and Anil Singh is related to Ramanuj, but then Anil Singh was completely unaware that Ramanuj does not have any right and title over the land as he was not a party to the proceeding with respect to the land in dispute at any stage upto Second Appeal before this Court. It is next submitted that even complainant has not made Ramanuj an accused in the instant case, but is pursuing the case against petitioner and her husband, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that Ramanuj died prior to institution of the instant complaint case, as such was not made an accused, it is reiterated and submitted that petitioner, concealing the earlier order of Circle Officer and DCLR, filed fresh mutation application and got the land mutated in her name, which was set aside by the Additional Collector. It is also submitted that non-bailable warrant of arrest has been issued against the petitioner.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submission made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



6. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

