

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.2939 of 2026.

1. **Dinesh Chandrabanshi @ Dinesh Ram Chandra Banshi
@ Dinesh Kumar**

2. **Rameshwar Prasad** **Petitioners.**

**Versus
The State of Bihar**

**Order
No.**

O R D E R

03 20-07-2026

1. The **petitioners**, apprehend arrest in connection with **Complaint Case (official) No. 127(o)/2018**, wherein the learned Magistrate, vide order dated 18.05.2018, found a prima facie case under Sections 191, 192, 193, 196, 198, 199, 200, 415, 417, 465, 466 and 468 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
2. Heard Sri Durgesh Nandan, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Rajesh Kumar, learned Public Prosecutor for the State.
3. Briefly stated, the complaint has been instituted pursuant to directions issued by the Hon'ble Patna High Court vide order dated 05.02.2018 in Criminal Appeal No. 3573 of 2017 (S.J.) (Dinesh Chandrabanshi vs. State of Bihar). The allegation is that the accused persons knowingly made a false statement on oath regarding the criminal antecedents of Dinesh Chandrabanshi (petitioner no. 1) while seeking regular bail before the Hon'ble High Court.

It is alleged that petitioner no. 1 had filed Criminal Appeal No. 3573 of 2017 (S.J.) under Section 14A(2) of the SC/ST Act seeking regular bail in connection with Dehri SC/ST P.S. Case No. 68 of 2016. In paragraph 3 of the appeal memo, it was specifically declared that the appellant had no criminal antecedents. The affidavit in support of the appeal was sworn by petitioner no. 2, Rameshwar Prasad, who is the full brother of petitioner no. 1.

During the hearing on 09.01.2018, learned counsel for the informant brought to the notice of the Hon'ble High Court that the appellant was involved in several other criminal cases and produced copies of the relevant FIRs, thereby demonstrating that

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.2939 of 2026.

**Contd.....
(20-07-2026)**

the declaration made on oath was false. Taking cognizance of the alleged concealment and false declaration, the Hon'ble High Court issued show-cause notices to both petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present complaint has been instituted at the instance of the Hon'ble Patna High Court, with the learned Registrar General as the complainant. It is further submitted that the allegation against the petitioners pertains to the filing of a false affidavit by petitioner no. 2 regarding the antecedents of petitioner no. 1 in the bail application. As regards petitioner no. 1, it is contended that he had no knowledge of the contents of the affidavit, as he was in judicial custody at Sasaram at the relevant time. With respect to petitioner no. 2, it is fairly admitted that he is the deponent who swore the affidavit stating that petitioner no. 1, though his own brother, had a clean antecedent, which statement was incorrect. It is further fairly submitted that petitioner no. 1 has five criminal antecedents, namely:

- (i) Chenari P.S. Case No. 3/2009, u/s 448, 385, 387, 34 of the IPC.
- (ii) Chenari P.S. Case No. 9/2014, u/s 324, 307, 379, 34 of the IPC.
- (iii) Chenari P.S. Case No. 80/2016, u/s 363, 366A, 34 of the IPC.
- (iv) Chenari P.S. Case No. 183/2017, u/s 409, 420, 467, 468, 34 of the IPC.
- (v) SC/ST Dehri P.S. Case No. 68/2016, u/s 420, 408, 323, 504, 506, 34 of the IPC and section 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST Act.

And petitioner no. 2 has one criminal antecedent being Chenari P.S. Case No. 103/2018, u/s 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 324, 307, 326, 354B, 452, 380, 509 of the IPC and 27 of Arms Act.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner no.1 had deliberately concealed his criminal antecedents while seeking bail before the Hon'ble High Court on the basis of a false affidavit which was sworn by petitioner no.2. Subsequently, the Hon'ble High Court, having noticed such

IN THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, PATNA

Anticipatory Bail Petition No.2939 of 2026.

**Contd.....
(20-07-2026)**

concealment, directed the Registrar General to institute a criminal complaint against the petitioner as well as the deponent of the affidavit. The petitioner had not approached the Hon'ble High Court with clean hands. Therefore, the petitioners does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances; rival submissions of the parties more particularly the submissions of learned Public Prosecutor, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the application stands ***rejected***.

(Dictated)

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar-I)

I/c Sessions Judge, Patna

Date of Order	20-07-2026
Date of Reserving Order	NA
Uploading Date	20-07-2026
Uploaded by	Rahul/-