

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE-I, GAYA
ANTICIPATORY BAIL PETITION No. 763/2026

=====

1. Rama Devi W/o Late Nagendra Narayan Singh
2. Anand Kumar @ Anand Prakash S/o Late Narendra Narayan Singh
Both R/o Village- Pakardih, Macharim, P.S.- Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya----- Petitioner
VERSUS

The State of Bihar

----- Opposite Party

=====

21.07.2026

A bail application has been filed on behalf of above named accused/petitioner, who is apprehending her arrest in connection with **Complaint Case No. 790/2024**, for the offences registered **U/s. 406, 420 of I.P.C., pending in the Court of Ld. A.C.J.M.-V, Gaya.**

2. Heard both the sides on the bail application.

3. Learned defence counsel, submitted that prior to this, the petitioner has not filed either anticipatory or regular bail petition before this Court or before the Hon'ble Patna High Court. It is further submitted that petitioner is innocent, committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. Petitioner No. 1 executed power of attorney in favour of accused Mrinal Kishore on 22.01.2009 and 01.04.2010. Petitioner has not executed deed of bai beyana in favour of accused Deepak Kumar dated 17.03.2017 and petitioner is not acquainted with the accused Deepak Kumar and the petitioner No. 1 has not received single farthing from the complainant Raju Kumar. No block number of land were prepared in presence of the petitioners and Mrinal Kishore carved out the block number of the land. Complainant and other vendees has not directly consulted the petitioner No. 1 and he has executed sale deed as per direction of Mrinal Kishor and Mrinal Kishor has shown the land to the vendees. The consideration money which has been received by the petitioner No. 1 does not tally with the deed of agreement executed and petitioner No. 1 received Rs. 1,00,000/- per katha through Mrinal Kishor on 17.03.2017 through this deed is not executed by the petitioner. Deepak Kumar has shown the forged

and fabricated deed to Raju Kumar and executed deed of Beyana in favour of complainant on 18.05.2018. No case U/s 420, 406 of I.P.C. are made out against the petitioners. There is no allegation against the petitioner No. 2 Anand Kumar because he has no concern with the sale and purchase of the land and he is the son of the petitioner No. 1. Lastly, he submitted that the petitioner No. 1 having one criminal antecedent vide Complaint Case No. 862/2023 in which she is on bail whereas petitioner No. 2 has no criminal antecedent. Hence, it is prayed for granting the anticipatory bail to the accused petitioners.

4. Per contra the Ld. A.P.P. appeared on behalf of State has opposed the prayer for bail.

5. Prosecution case, in brief, as per complainant is that witness Raju Kumar who is brother in law of the complainant has entered into an agreement with accused Deepak Kumar on dated 13.05.2018 by the accused agreed to sale the land bearing Khata No. 905(New), Plot No. 4719, 4720, 4721, area 03 katha and the accused Deepak Kumar received consideration money of Rs. 8,70,000/- from the witness Raju Kumar on different dates. It is alleged that Deepak Kumar has also shown the agreement paper with the accused Rama Devi dated 17.03.2017 in which it is mentioned that Rama Devi has made an agreement for sale with accused Deepak Kumar appertaining to Khata No. 909 (new) Plot No. 4719, 4720, 4721, area 2 are 78 decimals. It is alleged that accused Rama Devi executed deed of sale in favour of relative of Raju Kumar on 14.07.2018. It is further alleged that in the aforesaid sale deed Mrinal Kishore made his signature as a witness, although he is the middle person to connect with the other accused persons to the complainant and one Raju Kumar and he also said that land is very clear and no objection would be raised in future and peaceful possession must be given to the parties i.e. to the vendees. It is further alleged that after execution of the aforesaid sale deed complainant and his relative Raju Kumar on many times approached to the accused persons and requested to carved out their respective lands as per sale deed but the accused persons could not take interest to measurement of the share of their lands and now the position is that some boundary wall were erected over the land by other persons and the respective of the land of the vendees could not be located as per sale deed. Prior to execution of the sale deed the

accused persons has given map chart of the said land in which block numbers are mentioned. Accused persons has taken the amount of Rs. 8,70,000/- from the complainant and his relative Raju Kumar who is the karta of the family and cheated the amount. On 26.05.2024 the complainant and Raju Kumar went at the resident of accused Rama Devi and requested them to give the possession over the land as per sale deed but the accused persons misbehaved with them.

6. Heard both the parties and perused the material available on record. From perusal, it appears that this is complaint case. The allegation against the petitioners is that they took money from the complainant in lieu of registering his three katha land and they also executed sale deed and when complainant and one witness approached to accused persons and requested them to carve out of their respective land as per sale deed but the accused persons did not take interest to measurement of the share of their land and now the position is that some boundary walls were erected over the land by other persons and the respective of the land of the witness (vendee) could not be located as per sale deed. Prosecution has filed a sale deed to show that accused petitioner Rama Devi has already sold the said land prior to execution of the sale deed to complainant. From perusal of the order-sheet of this bail application, it also appears that on 28.03.2026 accused petitioners have got the benefit of no-coercive step on the basis of promise before the Court that they will locate the disputed land within 15 days but now they will not ready to do.

7. Thus, considering the facts and circumstances of the case as discussed above and gravity of allegation, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby **rejected**.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Shashi Kant Ojha)
Addl. Sessions Judge-1, Gaya
21.07.2026