

In the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge - VIII, Patna
A.B.P. No. 3211/2026
[Arising Out of Complaint Case No. 13545(C)/2025]

Manoj Kumar, aged about 48 years, s/o Uma Shankar Prasad, r/o
New Manichak, P.O. & P.S. - Masaurhi, Dist- Patna

---Petitioner

Vs

State of Bihar

---Opposite party

Advocate for Petitioner -Shri Kumar Jinku Nirala, Ld. Advocate

Advocate for Informant -Shri Surya Prakash Singh , Ld. Advocate

Advocate for State - Shri Ramdev Paswan, Ld. A.P.P.

O R D E R

13.08.2026 An anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of accused/petitioner namely Manoj Kumar, who is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 13545(C)/2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 319 and 336 of B.N.S. pending in the Court of Ms. Garima Singh, J.M.F.C., Patna, has been pressed for hearing by his Ld. Counsel Shri Kumar Jinku Nirala.

Heard Ld. Counsel for the petitioner, Ld. Counsel for the informant and Ld. A.P.P. for the State.

The case of the prosecution in brief is that the complainant Prema Kumari entered into an agreement of sale dated 18.09.2020 with accused persons namely Ranvijay Singh, Sanjay Kumar and Chandrakant Kumar and in terms of agreement to sale the complainant had paid Rs. 16 lakhs to the accused persons through cheques in different dates and in this regard, an endorsement about the receiving of amount have been recorded in the agreement to sale. The said agreement to sale was executed on 18.09.2020 for registry of 20 dhur land situated at Mauza-Dumri, Circle- Punpun. Further, the case of the complainant is that at the time of agreement dated 18.09.2020, all the accused were present there, but the accused have not executed the sale deed in the favour of the complainant. Further, the case of the complainant is that when the accused did not executed the sale deed, then she demanded the amount, then the accused returned the amount of

Rs. 5 lakhs to the complainant. Further, the case of the complainant is that when she demanded her amount, then they threatened her to implicate in criminal case.

The learned advocate for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is quite innocent and has not committed any offence rather he has been falsely implicated in this case. The prosecution case is false, fabricated and concocted one. The petitioner has neither any role in the sale -purchase of land with regard, for which the agreement to sale executed between the complainant and other accused persons nor has any role in the payment of of the alleged money to the other accused persons. The petitioner also has no criminal antecedent. The petitioner is the colleague of the husband of the complainant. There is omnibus allegation against this petitioner. The petitioner is ready to furnish the bail bond to the satisfaction of this Court. So, it has been prayed to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

On the other hand, the learned A.P.P. appearing for the State opposed the prayer of bail petition and prayed to reject the anticipatory bail petition whereas the counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submitted that the accused/ petitioner had taken Rs. 16 lakhs from the complainant on false pretext and later on returned Rs. 5 lakh. The intention of the accused/ petitioner apparent from his conduct that he deceived the complainant in order to get money from him. So, he does not deserve bail.

Heard both the sides and perused the record. From the perusal of the record it appears that the complainant has filed this case against the accused registered for the offence u/s 316(2), 319 and 336 of B.N.S. for cheating her in order to get money of Rs. 16 lakhs and later on, on demand of the same the accused persons have returned only Rs. 5 lakhs. On perusal of case records, it appears that the complainant has entered into an agreement to sale with the accused persons Ranvijay Singh, Sanjay Kumar and Chandrakant Kumar and also paid the entire amount of rupees sixteen lac to them only and this petitioner has no role in the transactions entered by the complainant with other accused persons and the only allegations against the petitioner is that he has purchased the land from the accused persons and no specific role has been played by this petitioner with regard to execution of

agreement to sale and payment of money by the complainant.

Thus, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and nature of allegation as brought against the petitioner, this anticipatory bail petition is allowed. The petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 7,000/- (Rupees Seven thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned court concerned within a period of fifteen days from the date of communication of a copy of this order, subject to condition as laid down Section 482 of B.N.S.S.

(Dictated & Corrected)
Sd/-
(Ajay Kumar-I)
Addl. Sessions Judge-VIII
Patna
13.08.2026