

**IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL AND DISTRICT SESSIONS JUDGE-IV,**

**AURANGABAD**

A.B.P. No.- 374/2026

Arising Out of Complaint Case no. 1014/2023

Rahul Kumar Vs.The State of Bihar

ORDER DATED 28.03.2026

The instant Anticipatory Bail Petition has been filed by Rahul Kumar, S/O-Bindeshwar Chaudhari, Age-31 Years, R/O village-Belwai, PS-Karakat, District- Rohtas (Bihar) arising out of Complaint Case no. 1014/2023 pending in the court of Sri Subhankar Shukla JM 1<sup>st</sup> Class Aurangabad under Sections 406, 420, 384, 504, 120(B)/34 of the IPC Act.

Sri Ashok Kumar Gupta, the learned counsel on behalf of the petitioner stated that no bail petition had been filed either in the present Court or in the Hon'ble Patna High Court. Petitioner had clean antecedents and has been falsely been implicated in the present case as no money was borrowed by the petitioner from the complaint. Instant the complaint was maternal uncle of the petitioner and the mentioned maternal uncle was suffering from T.B. The petitioner was looking after his uncle and whatever money was being spent by him in treatment of his uncle it was being paid by the uncle by transferring in his bank account. Subsequently, the parties had tensed relationship and the complaint taking advantage of the situation instituted the present false case against him. In light of given facts the learned Counsel prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

The learned A.P.P. Sri Irshad Alam vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail petition on the ground that the allegations imposed against the petitioner was serious in nature.

Heard both the sides and perused the case record.

On perusal of case record it is revealed that summoning order in the present case has been passed u/s- 406, 417, 506 of the IPC. against the petitioner. The allegation on the petitioner is that the complaint transferred different amount on different date in the bank account of the petitioner from the year 2012 to 2022 for his studies. In total Rs. 27,99,200/- was credited in the bank account of the petitioner in the said duration. Perusal of the case record depict that the documentary proof is on record to show financial transaction between the parties. As the money involved in the present case is huge which

backed by documentary evidence which is still not returned by the petitioner, hence the court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on the Anticipatory Bail. Accordingly, the Anticipatory bail petitioner Rahul Kumar is hereby **rejected.**

Dictated by

District & Additional Sessions Judge IV,  
Aurangabad (Bihar)

28.03.2026