

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3113 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-632 Year-2024 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Chandrasekhar Singh S/o Ramkeshwar Prasad Singh @ Ram Keshwan Singh
R/o vill - ward no. 21, Chintamani Chak, P.S.- Mokamah, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ramdev Prasad Singh S/o Late Baiju Prasad Yadav R/o vill - Gopkita, P.S.-
Pandarakh, Distt.- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kumar Sameer, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rajendra Nath Jha, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 22-06-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No. 632 of 2024 registered for the offences
under Sections 318(1), 318(4), 351(2) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant has
alleged that all the five named accused persons, including the
petitioner, were running a brick kiln. It has been alleged that all
the partners of the brick kiln had to execute an agreement of sale
in favour of the informant and for that they had also paid the full
consideration money of Rs. 8,11,000/-. However, the sale letter
was signed by three of the partners, namely, Chandrasekhar



Singh (petitioner), Krishnanandan Kumar and Akhilesh Kumar, however, two of the partners, namely, Purshottam Singh and Ashok Singh, were not signing the agreement paper and thereafter, with the help of henchmen, they stopped the complainant from running the brick kiln.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the case, and from the perusal of the complaint, it is evident that nothing has been alleged against the petitioner and in fact, from the averments of the complainant, it would be clear that the petitioner had in fact put his signature along with two other accused persons. It has further been submitted that the complainant has not alleged anything against the petitioner as far as further running of the brick kiln is concerned and there is no allegation of cheating against the petitioner. It is further submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Krishnandan Kumar has already been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 19.09.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 66406 of 2025. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid submission, facts and



circumstances of the case, let the petitioner above named be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of eight weeks from today, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-(ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Complaint Case No. 632 of 2024 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure read with corresponding Section 482(2) of B.N.S.S. as well as subject to the following conditions:-

(i) One of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his close relative.

(ii) The petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each date of the trial.

(iii) In case of absence on two consecutive dates, or in violation of the terms of the bail, the bail bond of the petitioner will be liable to be cancelled by the Court concerned.

(iv) If the petitioner is found involved in similar nature of offence in future, the prosecution shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

(v) The learned Court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the



petitioner and in case, at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take steps for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is allowed.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

