

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
B.P. No. 627/2026
Sheo Pujan Mistri & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar
Complaint Case No. 34/2023

28.04.2026

Present :

For the petitioners --: Sri Uday Kumar, Ld. Advocate

For the informant----: Sri Ravikant, Ld. Advocate

For the State-----: Sri S. B. Ojha, Ld. Public Prosecutor

The present petition for regular bail has been filed on behalf of petitioners Sheo Pujan Mistri and Sonu Kumar who are in judicial custody since 18.11.2025 in connection with Complaint Case No. 34/2023 registered for the offence punishable under sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 34 of the IPC.

The prosecution story in brief is that the accused/petitioners proposed to the complainant to purchase a land bearing Khata No. 206, plot no. 936 situated at Suhari and executed an agreement to sell the said property. It is alleged that the petitioners received a total advance of Rs 21,50,000/- from the complainant on different dates. However, despite receiving the money, the petitioners neither executed the sale deed nor returned the amount instead, they sold the property to other persons.

Ld. counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case due to local village politics, and in fact, the allegations have been levelled with malafide intent to harass them. He further

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
B.P. No. 627/2026
Sheo Pujan Mistri & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar
Complaint Case No. 34/2023

submits that the dispute, if any, is purely of a civil nature arising out of contractual obligations which has been given a criminal colour to pressurize the petitioners. He further submits that the petitioners carry no criminal antecedents and are languishing in jail since 18.11.2025.

Ld. counsel further submits that earlier the prayer for anticipatory bail of these petitioners was rejected vide order dated 21.05.2025 passed in ABP No. 394/2025 and now they have approached this Court by way of regular bail.

Ld. counsel further submits that during the course of time, both the parties have settled their dispute and differences and now good feeling has been restored between them. He further submits that a joint compromise application duly signed by both the parties in this regard has also been filed and attached with this bail application, hence the prayer for bail of these petitioners may be considered favorably.

Ld. P.P. as well as Ld. counsel for the complainant has also been heard.

The complainant of this case has also appeared before the Court who accepted that the entire money has been returned to him and that now he has got no grievance against the petitioners.

Considering the facts and circumstances as well as the submissions, particularly the submission that the petitioners having no criminal antecedents are in judicial custody since

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, GAYA
B.P. No. 627/2026
Sheo Pujan Mistri & Anr. Vs. The State of Bihar
Complaint Case No. 34/2023

18.11.2025 and also in view of the joint compromise application, the prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby **allowed**. The petitioners are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of **Rs. 25,000/-** with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

(Dictated and corrected)

Sd/-
(P. K. Malik)
Sessions Judge, Gayaji
28.04.2026

Date of Judgment/Order	28.04.2026
Date of reserving Judgment/Order	N/A
Uploading Date	06.05.2026
Uploaded by	Steno (Vikash Kumar)