IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65792 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010956932026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-192 Year-2026 Thana- SHAHPUR PATORI District- Samastipur

==========

Ram Ikbal Sah @ Ram Akbal Sah @ Ram Ekwal Sah S/o Yogi Sah Resident of Village- Dumduma, PS- Shahpur, Patori, District- Samastipur

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Dhurjati Kumar Prasad, Advocate Mr. Ram Shankar Prasad, Advocate Mrs. Jahan Ara, Advocate Mr. Rohit Ranjan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Madhav Kumar, Advocate Mr. Ajay Kumar, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL ORDER

4 19-11-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 340(2), 3(5) of the BNS and later on 338 of the BNS was added.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along with other co-accused persons induced the informant to purchase land and received approx Rs. 47.89 lakh but they neither executed sale deed nor returned the money.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

WEB COPY

the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and a totally civil dispute has been given a criminal colour. It has been pointed out on the basis of Annexure-P/2 that a plot of land, the number of which is the same as that in the FIR, has already been transferred in the name of Sonam Kumari, who is the wife of the informant and as such, the allegation that the sale deed has not been executed after taking money, does not have legs to stand. It is further submitted that the other sale deed has also been executed in favour of one Dashrath Kumar and the document has been annexed as Annexure-P/3. It has also been submitted that although, the said sale deed was executed on 29.11.2025, however, the informant instead of taking recourse to remedies for challenging the said sale deed if he had any objection to the same, has chosen to file the present FIR. The petitioner having no criminal antecedent, is in custody since 19.07.2026. Charge-sheet has been submitted and he undertakes to cooperate in the trial.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant opposed the bail petition on the ground that the petitioner has caused loss to the informant by misrepresenting the facts and it thus, constitutes an offence of cheating and criminal breach of trust.

WEB COPY

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the matter relates to execution of sale deed and the charge-sheet has already been submitted in the present case, the petitioner having clean antecedent, is not required for any custodial interrogation, coupled with the fact that he has undertaken to cooperate in the trial, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.C.J.M., Shahpur Patori, Samastipur/concerned Court below in connection with Shahpur Patori P.S. Case No. 192 of 2026.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

priyanka/-

U		T	

WEB COPY