

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA**

**Anticipatory Bail Petition No.713 of 2026.**

**Supriya Pratik**

..... **Petitioner.**

**Versus**

**The State of Bihar**

**Order  
No.**

**Date**

**O R D E R**

**09      02-04-2026**

- 1.** The **petitioner, Supriya Pratik**, seeks anticipatory bail in connection with **Sri Krishna Puri P.S. Case No. 40/2026**, registered under Sections 308(5), 318(4), 329(3), 336(3), 338 read with 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS).
- 2.** Heard Sri Rajesh Ranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Rajesh Kumar, learned Public Prosecutor for the State as well as Sri Vijay Anand, learned counsel for the informant.
- 3.** The prosecution case, in brief, is that the informant, Dr. Veena Bhatiya, alleges that the petitioner along with her co-accused husband, Anup Kumar Singh, fraudulently executed a sale deed concerning a shop belonging to the informant's late husband. On 02.01.2026, co-accused Anup Kumar Singh sent a draft "Agreement to Sell" via WhatsApp to the informant, containing false statements and bearing only the petitioner's signature. When the informant refused to sign, Anup Kumar Singh deposited ₹4,43,000 into her account between 2 January and 5 January 2026, which she claims to have immediately returned. On 5 January 2026, the informant issued a letter to both accused, clearly rejecting the draft agreement and stating her unwillingness to sell the shops. Despite this, Anup Kumar Singh allegedly forged her signature on the agreement and began misleading tenants, pressuring them to vacate. He further sent a WhatsApp message on 08.01.2026, falsely asserting that the informant had executed an agreement on 02.01.2026 and received ₹15 lakh in cash. The informant, through her lawyer, replied to this legal notice on 24.01.2026.
- 4.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although allegations have been made against both accused regarding the fraudulent sale deed, the primary accusations are directed at co-accused husband

**IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA**

**Anticipatory Bail Petition No.713 of 2026.**

Contd....  
(02-04-2026)

Anup Kumar Singh. This is evident both from the FIR, as well as, from the fact that during investigation, a notice under Section 94 of BNSS was served upon co-accused Anup Kumar Singh. Furthermore, the petitioner is a woman with no prior criminal record.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, assisted by learned counsel for the informant, opposed the petitioner's prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the informant argued that, as stated by the petitioner herself in paragraph 8 of the bail application, her only involvement was signing an agreement prepared by her co-accused husband. He further submitted that the investigation and the case diary corroborate the prosecution's case. The Public Prosecutor, however, fairly acknowledged that the case diary contains nothing to contradict the petitioner's assertion of having a clean criminal record.
6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case; nature of accusation against the petitioner and the fact that her co-accused husband has been alleged to have forged the signature of the informant on the agreement; the submissions of both sides; and that the petitioner is a woman with clean criminal antecedent, the prayer for anticipatory bail is **allowed**. It is ordered that in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned court below within four weeks from the date of receipt of this order, the above-named petitioner shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court below subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of the BNSS.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rupesh Deo)  
Sessions Judge, Patna

Date of Judgment/Order	02-04-2026
Date of Reserving Judgment/Order	01-04-2026
Uploading Date	02-04-2026
Uploaded by	Amjad/-