

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.80140 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1919 Year-2018 Thana- GOPALGANJ COMPLAINT CASE  
District- Gopalganj

=====

Yogendra Pandit Son of Late Gokhula Pandit Resident of Vill- Banjaari, P.S.-  
Town, District- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                                                                                                      |
|----------------------|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Ramadhya Singh, Advocate<br>Mr. Satya Ranjan Sinha, Advocate<br>Ms. Seema Kumari, Advocate       |
| For the Respondent   | : | Mr. Dhananjay Kumar, Advocate<br>Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Opadhyay, Advocate<br>Mr. Raju Prasad, Advocate |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Manjesh Raj, Advocate<br>Mr. Md. Aslam Ansari, APP                                               |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      02-02-2026                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has prayed for bail in connection with Complaint Case No. C-1919/2018 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 466, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution based on the complaint petition in short is that the petitioner has forged the documents of the learned trial court and has obtained a decree. The complainant came to know that no Vakalatnama or W.S. was filed by the mother of the complainant, but the same was filed



by some impostor.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner in this case is that he has forged the signature of defendant no. 2 in Title Suit No. 153 of 1988 and has also fraudulently prepared an order in decree on the dates when there was holidays in the court. He also submits that the allegations which are made against the petitioner are triable by the Judicial Magistrate, First Class. He further submits that the petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 11.02.2024.

5. The application for bail is vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the informant and the learned APP for the State. Learned counsel for the informant submits that the petitioner is having criminal antecedent of 19 cases of similar nature and that two inquiries are pending even in the High Court against the petitioner.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail **with the condition**



**that the petitioner shall mark his attendance weekly on Gopalganj Town P.S. as most of the cases against the petitioner are of Gopalganj and shall cooperate in trial and will be physically present on each and every date fixed by the learned trial court, till the disposal of the case.** The above named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. ten thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gopalganj in connection with Complaint Case No. 1919 of 2018.

**(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)**

Sudhanshu/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

