

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81873 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9222 Year-2023 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Ranjita Singh @ Ranjeeta Singh Wife of Late Jitesh Ranjan Singh R/o
Raghuraj Patha, Chandmari Road, Ward No. - 29, West Gali of Police Chauki,
P.O. - Lohia Nagar, P.S. - Kankarbagh, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smt. Vibha Verma Wife of Sri Sanjay Kumar Permanent Resident of Vill.-
Sikharichak, ward No.-23, P.O.- Mokama Ghat, P.S.- Mokama, District-
Patna, At present residing at Haridayal Clinic, Tarkeswar Path, Chandmari
Road, P.O.- Lohia Nagar, Kankarbagh, P.S. Kankarbagh, District- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Digvijay Narayan Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Dilip Kumar Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 13-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, complainant
and the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in Complaint Case No.
9222(C) of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Complaint case, in brief, is that in search of land for
residential house, complainant was induced by co-accused Dipu
Prasad Yadav and Shailesh Kumar, who assured her that a plot
of land in Mauza Lohanipur, Mohalla Chandmari Road,
Kankarbagh, Patna was available and free from encumbrances.



On their assurance, complainant entered into an agreement with this petitioner and other two other accused persons and paid a total of Rs. 36.25 lacs, including Rs. 5 lacs as advance, by arranging funds through a bank loan. On 7.11.2022, the accused executed Sale Deed No. 16191 in favour of the complainant but when she began constructing house on the said land, some persons objected, showing an earlier Sale Deed No. 7297 dated 4.12.1979 in favour of their mother. Complainant alleges that the accused persons fraudulently executed sale deed, without disclosing previous sale deed, in her favour and cheated her of Rs. 33,57,051/- along with Rs. 2 lacs spent on construction.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Petitioner executed the registered sale deed in favour of the complainant with good title and gave her possession over the land. She was living in the same colony and took electricity connection on the land in question. It is further submitted that dispute involved in this case is with regard to sale and purchase of land which is purely of civil nature and for the same piece of land, title suit is also pending. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant vehemently opposed the bail application and submitted that petitioner is



named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that without disclosing the previous sale and conveyance of the same land, the accused persons fraudulently executed registered sale deed in favour of the complainant.

6. Considering the nature of accusation and gravity of the offence, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is refused.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

