

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68787 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-264 Year-2022 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

Vijay Ram S/O Late Banwari Ram R/O Mohalla- Katar, Balughat, P.S.-
Indrapuri, P.O.- Bardiha, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mahendra Pratap Singh S/O Late Ram Rahasya Singh R/O Vill.- Kali
Asthana, Purvi Mohan Bigha, Ward No.- 15, P.S.- Dehri (T), P.O.- Dehri,
Dist.- Rohtas

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 27-01-2026 Both the parties along with their respective advocate
are present in Chamber proceeding.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 264 of 2022 for the
offence under Sections 420, 120(B), 406, 467 and 468 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution story, the complainant has
alleged that for the purpose of constructing an educational
institution, he required a certain piece of land. On 20.10.2018,
the petitioner received part of the consideration amount by
cheque and part in cash in pursuance of Sale Deed No. 3879.
The petitioner further promised that the remaining amount of
₹4,98,000/- would be adjusted against the sale of additional



land. However, the accused-petitioner neither paid the balance amount nor executed any further sale deed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to a land dispute. From perusal of the registered sale deed, it is evident that a cheque number has been mentioned therein; however, the said cheque was never issued by the vendee to the vendor, nor was the same ever encashed by the petitioner. The petitioner received the alleged consideration amount through cheque from the complainant towards the sale of a piece of land which was executed in favour of the complainant's wife. It is further submitted that the petitioner never entered into any oral or documentary agreement to sell any other piece of land in favour of the complainant. Moreover this is a Civil/money dispute between the parties. A statement has been made in para 3 of the bail application that petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP opposes the prayer for bail.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court is inclined to extend him the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Let the petitioner be released on bail in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the date



of receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/-
(Ten thousand) each with two sureties of like amount each to the
satisfaction of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Dehri
(Rohtas), in connection with Complaint Case No. 264 of 2022
subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 of
B.N.S.S., as also with the condition that one of the bailors
should be close relative of the petitioner.

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

Ankit Kumar/-

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

