

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.89932 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-450 Year-2024 Thana- NAWADA MUFFASIL District- Nawada

Rajesh Ranjan Son of Late Krishanandan Sharma Resident of Village-
Bhadokhara, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Kanchan Mala W/o- Bhola Prasad Singh, R/O.- Gali No.-2, Shiv Nagar,
Gonawan, P.S.-Nawada, Dist.-Nawada

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Sharda Kumari, A.P.P.
For the Informant	:	Mr. Akshansh Ankit, Advocate
		Mr. Astitva Vatsa, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 11-05-2026 1. Heard Mr. Deepak Kumar, learned counsel for the
petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and Mr. Akshansh Ankit,
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2),
318(4) and 61(2) BNS.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of three cases and the informant
alleges that she entered into an agreement with the petitioner
and his mother for purchasing a plot of land and gave
Rs.24,50,000/- and even got a boundary wall constructed but the
sale deed till date has not been executed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that maternal grandfather of the husband of the informant resides in the village of the petitioner and, thus, the informant and the petitioner were known to each other. It is next submitted that no doubt, an agreement was entered in between the petitioner and his mother on one side and the informant on the other but then it is submitted that Rs.24,50,000/- was never received by them but then the petitioner admits that he received an amount of Rs.5,50,000/-.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that informant is a differently abled lady and since her husband was known to the petitioner, as such, an agreement was entered in between her and the petitioner and his mother. It is further submitted that from perusal of the agreement for sale (Annexure-R/1 to the counter affidavit), it would manifest that petitioner has given receiving with respect to Rs.17 lakhs in cash. It is next submitted that petitioner, apart from that, is accepting that he received an amount of Rs.5,50,000/, as such, as per petitioner the amount received by him is Rs.22.50,000/-. It is also submitted that what is not in



dispute rather stands admitted is that an agreement for sale was entered in between the parties, in pursuance whereof amount was paid, which as per the informant is Rs.24,50,000/- but petitioner is disputing the said amount and informant had constructed her boundary wall but then the sale deed till date has not been executed nor the petitioner and his mother intend to execute the sale deed nor are ready to return the amount, as such, it can be safely culled out that petitioner right from the beginning had intention to cheat. It is further submitted that informant has also left possession of the land.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the fact that from perusal of the agreement for sale, an amount of Rs.17 lakhs stands received by the petitioner and the sale deed till date has not been executed that amply demonstrates the conduct and intention of the petitioner.

7. At this stage, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that altogether eight persons have been made accused in the instant case out of which six accused have been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail and mother of the petitioner was arrested who was granted the privilege of regular bail, on which learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



informant submits that it is a fit case for regular bail.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Mufassil P.S. Case No. 450 of 2024 pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nawada/Successor Court.

9. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

