

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49184 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8138 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

-
1. Vishal Singh S/o Late Subhash Singh Resident of Village- Rampur, P.S.-
Maner, Dist.- Patna
 2. Sangeeta Devi @ Sangeeta Kumari Singh @ Sangita Kumari W/o Vishal
Singh Resident of Village- Ramnagar Basti, P.S.- Maner, Dist.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Manjit Kumar Singh S/o Late Someshwar Singh R/O Mohalla- Road No 17,
Rajeev Nagar, P.S.- Rajeev Nagar, Dist.- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Dr.Kamal Deo Sharma, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP
For Complainant	:	Mr. Ujjawal Kumar Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 Heard Dr.Kamal Deo Sharma, learned counsel for the

petitioners and Mr. Ujjawal Kumar Singh for the informant

beside Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 8138 of 2023 instituted
under Sections 323, 406, 420, 384 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the complaint, the complainant alleged that
the accused wanted to develop a business for which they asked
for investment, promising half share in the profit. Further,
undertaking was given that if they fail, the original amount will
be returned.



4. An account was opened in the name of petitioner no.02, the complainant accepting the words of the accused, Rs. 13, 49,440/- was paid to the accused, not to talk about the profit which could have around Rs.5,00,000/-. Accordingly, the complaint.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that not a single amount has been deposited in any of the account of the two accused persons and the accusation has been made only to tarnish their images in public.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant on the other hand counters the said version and submits that despite taking such a huge amount, the petitioners are trying to completely usurp the amount by denying the entire theory. Had there been tarnishing of the image, the petitioners would not have sat over the matter for three years and instead must have resorted to legal notice which has not been done.

7. Learned APP has taken this Court to the learned Sessions Judge order to show that the concerned Court sent the matter for mediation but the mediator's report dated 15.04.2026 recorded that it failed as the parties were not ready to come to a compromise.

8. The facts have been incorporated, the petitioner



no.1 also has a criminal antecedent, the matter is of the year 2023, despite cognizance took place years ago, now the petition for anticipatory bail, no case is made out. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

