

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91720 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-148 Year-2021 Thana- CHHATAUNI District- East Champaran

Suresh Giri Son of Late Yogendra Giri Resident of Village- Chhota
Bariyarpur, P.S.- Chhatauni, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sunil Kumar, S/O- Late Asharfi Sah Resident of Vill- Chhota Bariyarpur,
P.S.- Chhatauni, District- East champaran

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Priyesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Karandeep Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

3 19-03-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Chhatauni P.S. Case no. 148 of 2021 registered under sections 341, 323, 447, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that an agreement for sale was entered into by the vendor i.e. the petitioner herein and the informant with respect to the immovable property on 25.4.2006. Subsequently on the informant attempting to construct a boundary wall, it is stated that three accused persons came and started to hurl abuses and



gave threats to the informant. On enquiry, it transpire that the petitioner had also executed some document in their favour on 13.9.2007. As such, the informant states that the accused persons and specially the petitioner who happens to be his vendor have entered into a conspiracy to cheat him of the sum of the total consideration amount and are also giving threats to pay *rangdari* of Rs.5,00,000/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case, the nature of which is purely civil. Even from the contents of the FIR, it would transpire that while the informant states that agreement was entered into with him on 25.4.2006, the so called understanding with the other accused persons is alleged to be more that a year later on 13.9.2007. The petitioner categorically denies the allegations levelled in the FIR. He is in custody since 22.9.2025 and chargesheet has been submitted in the case. He has no criminal antecedent.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant. Learned counsel for the informant submits that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner of having committed fraud and of having cheated the informant by once again entering into an agreement with the other FIR named accused



persons subsequent to the sale of the land to the informant.
Disturbance has been created everyday by the accused persons.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation against the petitioner in the FIR, the petitioner having remained in custody for over five months since 22.9.2025 and chargesheet having been submitted in the case, the Court directs the petitioner to be enlarged on bail in connection with Chhatauni P.S. Case no. 148 of 2021 on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

saurovkrishna/-

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

