

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70459 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1620 Year-2018 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

-
1. Sangeeta Devi W/O Sanjeet Kumar Resident of Village- Dubhal, P.S-
Magadh Medical, District- Gaya
 2. Dharmendra Kumar @ Dharmendra Singh S/O Late Ram Swarup Singh
Resident of Village- Dubhal, P.S- Magadh Medical, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Baban Kumar Singh S/O Tribhuvan Singh R/O Village- Mandaul, P.S-
Chandauti, Distt.- Gaya.
3. Pankaj Singh Son of Kishori Singh R/o- Village- Dubhal P.S- Magadh
Medical District- Gaya.
4. Tuntun Singh Son Of Kishori Singh R/o- Village- Dubhal P.S- Magadh
Medical District- Gaya.
5. Kishori Singh Son of Khelawan Singh R/o- Village- Dubhal P.S- Magadh
Medical District- Gaya.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anand Vardhan, Advocate Ms. Shubhangi Pandey
For the State	:	Mr. Shyam Kumar Singh, APP Mr. Umesh Lal Verma
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sriram Krishna, Advocate Mr. Amarjeet, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 23-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the

learned APP for the State, and the learned counsel for the

Opposite Parties.

2. The petitioners apprehend arrest in connection with

Complaint Case No. 1620 of 2018 for offences under Sections

467, 468, 471, 406 and 420 of the IPC.



3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioners are accused of selling a piece of land which was a part of the sale-deed in the 1997. The petitioners have again sold the same land to the purchaser in 2017.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. He further submits that petitioner no. 2 is the legal heir (son) of the late Ram Swarup Singh and petitioner no. 1 is the daughter-in-law, and both have a share in the said property, and both sold their share in the property to Kumari Premlata (wife of the complainant) through a registered deed of sale dated 27.04.2017 which was duly registered only after due verification of documents.

5. The learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the Opposite Parties have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

6. I have considered the submissions made by the parties and have gone through the records of the case. It appears from the material on record that the petitioners have knowingly committed fraud by selling the same piece of land to the purchaser that had already been sold earlier.

7. Considering the aforesaid, this court is of the



considered opinion that petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail in the present case.

8. The application for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, dismissed.

9. The petitioners are directed to surrender in the court below within a period of four weeks from today and seek regular bail, failing which the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya will take all steps for the arrest of the petitioners.

10. It is, however, clarified that the observations made herein are limited to the adjudication of the present application and shall not prejudice the case of the petitioners at any subsequent stage of the proceedings.

11. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gaya through FAX for its compliance forthwith.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

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

