

In the court of Addl. District & Sessions Judge – XIII, Gaya
Present - Kumar Kartikey Shahi

Criminal Misc. No.225/2026 (S.J)
Reference in ABP No. 347/2026 Order Dated 11.03.2026
Arising Out of Delha P.S Case no. 05/2026
DAULTI DEVI AND OTHER

Vs

STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHER

Order

23.06.2026

A petition has been filed on behalf of applicants namely Daulti Devi, Avinash Paswan & Ashish Kumar praying that some important and relevant modification in the bail order dated 11.03.2026, passed by learned A.D.J - XIIIth, Gaya in connection with A.B.P 347/26 is required. Therefore prayed to pass an order to modify the bail order of the above mentioned case up to extent of making clarification by the informant to spot the persons in favour of whom, the remaining amount has to be transfered/paid back by the accused petitioners.

This petition is pressed, Ld. Counsel for applicants has submitted that the petitioners expressed their desire and intention to pay back the amount received by them from the prosecution side and it is very relevant and important to submit here that out of Rs. 40,00,000/-, the petitioners paid Rs. 15,00,000/- to the informant Ranvir Singh and in lieu of amicable settlement, a joint compromise was filed before the said learned court and in the very order dated 11/03/2026, the terms and conditions, incorporated in the said compromise petition has been referred. It is further submitted that though in Para 4 of the said compromise petition, the return of Rs. 15,00,000/- by the accused persons has been accepted by the informant Ranvir Singh but with regard to the remaining amount, two installment was decided but subsequently the person from whose account the advance money was paid and received by the accused persons, started claiming their respective amount as they had made transfer of their respective amount. It is further submitted that according to bank statement and status of account, Rs. 9,00,000/- was transferred by one Chandan Kumar on three different dates i.e. on 01/06/2022 Rs. 5,00,000/-, on 23/06/2022 Rs. 2,00,000/- and on 05/07/2022 Rs. 2,00,000/- was transferred by him in favour of account of accused Daulti Devi. It is further submitted that on the other hand, the Cheque No. - 358251 which has been referred in the F.I.R. and being claimed by the informant Ranvir Singh is absolutely wrong as the said cheque is of Rs. 10,00,000/- relates with one Rohit Kumar Singh and likewise the informant is also required to make clarification with regard to three other cheques including 358233, 358235 and 358234 as referred and relied in the F.I.R. by the accused Ranvir Singh. It is further submitted that on the other hand, the informant Ranvir Singh, who had transferred Rs. 13,00,000/- only and hence he was entitled for the said amount only but he realized Rs. 15,00,000/- i.e. he has illegally realized Rs. 2,00,000/- more than he received. It is further submitted that on account of the claims, being made by different persons, referred above, these petitioners could not be able to comply with the terms of the compromise which speaks the deposit of amount only in favour of

In the court of Addl. District & Sessions Judge – XIII, Gaya
Present - Kumar Kartikey Shahi

Criminal Misc. No.225/2026 (S.J)
Reference in ABP No. 347/2026 Order Dated 11.03.2026
Arising Out of Delha P.S Case no. 05/2026
DAULTI DEVI AND OTHER

Vs

STATE OF BIHAR AND OTHER

informant Ranvir Singh and hence it would be desirable in the ends of justice to ask the informant to clarify the sources of amount claimed by him in the very F.I.R., to enable these petitioners to comply with the terms of compromise by paying back the respective amounts in favor of different persons, who are claiming from the accused petitioners.

Therefore, the very bail order dated 11/03/2026 passed by learned A.D.J. XIIIth, Gaya in A.B.P. No. 347/2026 requires modification in light of submissions made above.

This Criminal Miscellaneous is filed for modification in the order passed by this Court on 11.03.2026 and submits that on account of claims made by different persons petitioners are not able to comply with terms of compromise.

Heard both parties and pressed the order passed in ABP 347/26 and compromise filed by parties and it is clearly mentioned in para-03 of compromise petition that amount to be returned to the informant and there was no any condition of payment to other persons.

However, during course of hearing O.P has filed petition and given account details of other persons who allegedly given money to applicant and also submits that they are ready to receive in different accounts, detail of which is given and also orally submits that he is ready to receive money in any of the accounts and one undertaking also given by Rohit Singh which is on record.

Under these facts and circumstances this Court finds that in original agreement petitioner has not raised any doubt, and in this Miscellaneous petition raised objection and prays for modification, but O.P is ready to receive amount in any bank account as given in his petition.

Therefore, this Miscellaneous Application is disposed with direction to applicant to return the balance amount within four weeks from the date of receiving of this order in the learned Court below.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

Kumar Kartikey Shahi

Addl. Sessions Judge – XIII, Gaya