

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63297 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-641 Year-2024 Thana- LAHERIYASARAI District- Darbhanga

Kamini Devi W/o Kedar Mahaseth @ kedar Nath Mahaseth @ Santosh Mahaseth R/o Mohalla- Bakarganj, Near Durga Hotel, P.S.- Laheriasarai, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Girish Chandra Jha
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad- A.P.P.
	Mr. Ebadur Rahman Shakeb
	Mr. Arun Kumar Bhagat

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of her arrest in Laheriasarai P. S. Case No.641 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 406, 420, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and the informant alleges that he purchased 01 kattha 15 dhur land from Bimal Kumar on 10.03.2024. After purchasing the land, the informant applied for



mutation before the Circle Officer, but Shila Devi objected the mutation. On enquiry, the informant came to know that Shila Devi got forged sale deed of the aforesaid purchased land of the informant executed to Kamini Devi (petitioner), in the sale deed of Shila Devi, the Jamabandi number of the land is recorded as 207, which does not pertain the said land, thus alleges that accused persons committed forgery.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that in sum and substance, the allegation against the petitioner that she executed a sale deed in favour of Shila Devi with respect to a piece of land which the informant claims to have purchased from Bimal Kumar. It is submitted that if informant or Bimal Kumar are aggrieved by the fact that petitioner executed a sale deed with respect to their land, in that event, the informant and Bimal Kumar both have remedy of approaching a Court of competent civil jurisdiction for getting the sale deed cancelled.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the case is not as easy as it is being



made out. It is further submitted that Shila Devi instituted SC/ST P. S. Case No. 23 of 2024 dated 12.03.2024 against Bimal Kumar with an allegation that her husband was working with Bimal and Bimal had promised to sell the land to her husband, but Bimal did not sell the land in favour of her husband. It is submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the SC/ST P. S. Case No. 23 of 2024, it would manifest that Shila Devi is the informant who alleges that her husband was working with Bimal and Bimal had promised to sell his land to her husband, but then, the land was not sold, as such, Shila Devi was aware of the fact that land belongs to Bimal, but still she got a sale deed executed through Kamini in her favour with respect to the land of Bimal which the informant had purchased from him. It is thus submitted that the accused persons in conspiracy committed the forgery. It is also submitted that investigation of the case is continuing.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the



privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

