

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51764 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-102 Year-2026 Thana- BEGUSARAI MUFFASIL District-
Begusarai

=====

Sandip Kumar @ Sandeep Sharma S/o Mantun Sharma R/o Village - Ward
no. 12, P.O.- Chilmil, P.S. - Muffasil, Dist. - Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Bidya Devi W/o Mahendra Sharma R/o Village - Ward no. 2, Chilmil, P.S. -
Muffasil, Dist. - Begusarai.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pritish Kumar Lal, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No.102 of 2026, F.I.R dated
09.05.2026 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 341, 323, 406, 420, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the petitioner and
co-accused, Dharamraj Paswan, induced the informant, Bidya
Devi, to purchase 2 kathas 12 dhurs of homestead land at
Village Chilmil for a total consideration of Rs.22,72,000,
representing that the land was available for sale. Relying on



their representations, the informant paid Rs.11,28,000 initially and subsequently made further payments of Rs.27,000 and Rs.25,000 towards the sale consideration. Her relative, Sukhdev Sharma, also agreed to purchase land under a separate agreement. After receiving the payments, the accused allegedly failed to execute the sale deed despite repeated requests. When the matter was taken before the village Sarpanch, the accused returned only Rs.15,000 and allegedly cheated the informant by showing land belonging to another person. It is further alleged that on 09.05.2026, when the informant demanded the return of her money, the accused threatened and drove her away.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case merely because he is a witness to the agreement to the sale deed dated 28.06.2021, although he is not entitled to derive any benefit under the said agreement. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedent and is a man of means and would not mis-use the privilege of anticipatory bail if the same is extended in his favour.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances



that petitioner has been implicated in the present case merely because he is a witness to the agreement to the sale deed dated 28.06.2021, although he is not entitled to derive any benefit under the said agreement and the petitioner has clean antecedent. Accordingly, this Court is inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his/her arrest or surrender before the Court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-Ist, Begusarai, in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No.102 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita and with other following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative/known of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document/personal affidavit to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two



consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail
cancellation of his/her/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or
promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences,
failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for
cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any
criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty
to take steps for cancellation of their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

sharun/-

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

