

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78095 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-218 Year-2024 Thana- BIHARIGANJ District- Madhepura

Rinku Kumari W/O Bechan Das R/o village - Gopalpur, Ward no.- 5, Chank
faizullah, P.O- Gopalpur, P.S- Udakishunganj, Dsitric- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sunil Kumar Thakur S/O Bhupendra Thakur R/O Vill.- Hathiyondha, Ward
No.- 03, Bihariganj, Dist- Madhepura

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr.Arinjay Kumar, Advocate Mr. Shivam Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Manoj Kumar, APP
For the O.P.No.2	:	Mr. Bhola Prasad, Advocate Mr. Ashok Kumar No.6, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 03-04-2026 Heard learned counsels for the respective parties.

2. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking cancellation of bail granted to opposite party no.2 vide order dated 20.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.21955 of 2025 by this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has sought cancellation of bail on the ground that the opposite party no.2 filed a forged and fabricated document, i.e., *Panchnama* dated 28.08.2022 which has been annnexed as Annexure-P/2 with Cr. Misc. No.21955 of 2025. However, the said document was never executed by the petitioner and she



never entered into any compromise. The opposite party no.2 misled this Court on the basis of forged document in order to procure bail. The learned counsel further submits that opposite party no.2 made a *Panchnama* on the basis of forged signature of the petitioner as the petitioner has filed the present case as Rinku Kumari and signature on the *Panchnama* was put as Rinku Devi. The petitioner completely denies the fact that she ever executed such document. The learned counsel further submits that the opposite party no.2 has also given threat to the family members of the petitioner and has been putting pressure upon her to compromise the case. On these two grounds, the petitioner seeks cancellation of bail of the opposite party no.2.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party no.2 vehemently contends that the opposite party no.2 never threatened the petitioner or her family members and completely false allegation has been made on this account. The learned counsel further submits that so far as allegation of filing a forged and fabricated *Panchnama* dated 28.08.2022, which has been annexed as Annexure-P/2 with Cr. Misc. No.21955 of 2025 is concerned, the same is a genuine document. The petitioner used to sign her name as Rinku Devi as well as Rinku Kumari as is apparent from her complaint filed



earlier against one Nawal Kishore Jaiswal vide Complaint Case No. 168/2022 wherein the petitioner put her signature as Rinku Devi and also mentioned her name as Rinku Devi. There is no forgery in the signature of the petitioner. The learned counsel further submits that if the name of the petitioner is Rinku Kumari and she has earlier filed complaint case in the name of Rinku Devi, it is a matter of investigation as to why the present complaint case which has been converted in the FIR bearing Bihariganj P.S. Case No. 218/2024 dated 30.06.2024 has been filed in the name of Rinku Kumari. It rather shows the petitioner has not even signed the present complaint and the complaint has been filed at the instance of the some other person and the petitioner is being used as a tool to harass the opposite party no.2 who has serious dispute with one Santosh Singh. The learned counsel further submits that except for these two grounds, there is no other ground for cancellation of bail. However, perusal of the order dated 20.08.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No.21955 of 2025 shows this Court after considering all the facts and circumstances and taking note of doubtful nature of allegation against the petitioner (opposite party no.2 herein) and also considering the period of custody of the opposite party no.2 and his clean antecedent as well as submission of charge



sheet, granted bail to opposite party no.2 and there is no ground for cancellation of bail.

5. Perused the record.

6. From perusal of record, I find that the present petition has been filed by the petitioner with allegation of opposite party no.2 giving threats to the petitioner and her family members, which is not supported by any cogent material, with further allegation of the petitioner about commission of forgery and fabrication of the *Panchnama* dated 28.08.2022, which has been annexed as Annexure-P/2 with Cr. Misc. No.21955 of 2025. Except for these two grounds, no other ground has been laid before this Court for cancellation of bail. Since the allegation of extending threats by the opposite party no.2 is not supported by any cogent material, the allegation is not worth consideration. On the other hand, as the *Panchnama* dated 28.08.2022 has already been annexed before the learned Sessions Court, any claim of it being a forged and fabricated document by the petitioner should have been raised at the first instance before the court concerned where the document was first produced. But the petitioner did not do so. Since the document has already been produced before the learned Sessions Court, considering the nature of allegation, liberty is



granted to the petitioner to raise this issue before the learned Sessions Court where *Panchnama* dated 28.08.2022 was first produced and the said court would look into the matter and take steps to verify the genuineness of said document and signature of the petitioner.

7. At the same time, finding no ground for cancellation of bail, the present petition is dismissed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

V.K.Pandey/-

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

