

1. **Accused: Chinta Devi**, Aged 48 years, W/o- Sudeshwar Mistry @ Sudeshwar Vishwakarma,
2. **Sudeshwar Mistry @ Sudeshwar Vishwakarma**, Aged 50 years, S/o- Late Kishun Mistry,
3. **Pankaj Kumar**, Aged 30 years, S/o- Sudeshwar Mistry @ Sudeshwar Vishwakarma.

All R/o – Vill.- Sipara Dih, P.S.- Beur, Dist- Patna .

..... **Petitioners**

**VS**

1. **State of Bihar**

..... **Opposite Party**

Sl. No.	Date of Order of Proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
	<b>24.04.2026:</b>	<p>1. This anticipatory bail application has been filed on behalf of petitioners namely <b>Chinta Devi, Sudeshwar Mistry @ Sudeshwar Vishwakarma, and Pankaj Kumar</b> who are apprehending their arrest in connection with <b>Complaint case no. 1450(C) of 2022</b> for the offence U/S 420, 323 &amp; 379 of IPC.</p> <p>2. The case is called out. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Addl. P.P. for the state and perused the record.</p> <p>3. The case of the complainant namely Lalti Devi especially as per her S.A. in brief is that she purchased a piece of land measuring about 12 dhur from the Petitioner No.1 in the year 2019 for a consideration amount of Rs. 18,00,000/- and after purchase she mutated the said land in her name and rent receipts have also issued. Further she alleged that when she went to take possession of the land, she came to know that the land in question does not belong to Petitioner Chinta Devi and thereafter she demanded refund of the money. It is also alleged that when she make village panchayat on 31.01.2022, during panchayati Petitioners along with 8-10 other persons abused and assaulted the complainant and Petitioner Chinta Devi snatched the gold chain of the complainant and handed over to</p>	

<p><b><u>Contd.</u></b> <b><u>24.04.2026</u></b></p>	<p>her husband Petitioner No.2 Sudeshwar Mistry. Thereafter, Complainant has filed this case for obtaining the aforesaid land.</p> <p>4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive of the complainant. The complainant has not approached this learned court with clean hand and suppressed the material facts of this case. Petitioner no.1 Chinta devi had earlier purchased the said land from Raj Kumar Singh and Jay Prakash Singh through a valid registered sale deed and the land was mutated in her name and she was paying rent to the Bihar Govt. Due to financial necessity Petitioner sold the land to the complainant. Complainant has not produced any official report from any land authority showing that Petitioner no.1 had no title over the land or that sale deed was based on forged documents. Petitioner no. 2 &amp; 3 are only witnesses to the alleged sale deed and had no role in the alleged transaction. Petitioners belong to a respectable family who have got no criminal antecedent. Hence, taking into consideration all the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners deserve to be released on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>5. On the other hand learned Addl. P.P. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners contending that petitioners have embezzled huge money of the complainant by way of cheating. Hence, petitioners do not deserve for anticipatory bail.</p> <p>6. Heard both parties, perused the record, and other materials available on the record. The allegation brought against the petitioners is of serious nature as they have obtained huge money about Rs. Eighteen Lac from the complainant in the collusion with other accused. They fraudulently executed sale deed, and neither given possession nor refund the obtained amount. Both Complainant (Lalti Devi) and Petitioner (Sudeshwar Mistry) are present physically before this court today and Petitioner refused to give possession of the said executant land.</p>	
--	---	--

<p><b><u>Contd.</u></b> <b><u>24.04.2026</u></b></p>	<p>Thus, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and nature of allegation attributed against the petitioners being serious in nature, I am not inclined for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Their prayer for anticipatory bail arising out of <b>Complaint case no. 1450(C)/2022</b> is, therefore, <b>rejected.</b></p> <p>(Dict.) Sd/- D.A.S.J.-IV Patna</p>	
--	---	--