

COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- IIIrd, SAHARSA

ABA No.- 639/2026

Arising out of Complaint Case No.- 13/2017

Ram Pravesh and three others

Petitioners

Versus

State of Bihar

Opp. Party

Date of order or proceeding	Order with signature of the court	Office action taken with date
22.07.2026	1. The present anticipatory bail petition has been filed on behalf of accused persons namely 1. Ram Pravesh sah, 2. Gopi Sah, 3. Sibuh Sah and 4. Ramdhan Sah who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 13/2017 registered for the offences punishable U/Ss-465, 468, 471 and 120(B) of IPC. The record has been been put up for hearing. 2. Heard Sri Rajeev Ranjan Jha, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned A.P.P. Sri Sadanand Yadav for the State. 3. The case of complaint in brief as per typed information of Ajnash Sah stated that petitoners are in collusion with complainant's brother prepared forged documents and fraudulently sold the petitioner's land through a kevala (sale deed). It is submitted that the officials and employees of the circle office, Simri Bakhtiyarpur, in collusion with complainant's brother committed fraud in the jamabandi register. In jamabandi no.-4 relating to land recorded in the name of the complainant's grandfather namely Late Adhik Sah situated in Hariraho mouza, they allegedly deleted the name of Laxman Sah. It is further stated that the fathers name of Laxman Sah is Adhik Sah whereas the father's name of Later Adhik Sah was Raghubar Sah. This substitution is alleged to have been made fraudulently. Complainant's grandfather, Late Adhik Sah had only one son namely Late Laxman Sah. Late Laxman Sah had four sons namely 1. Anjash Sah, 2. Anantlal Sah, 3. Jayram Sah,	

ABA No.- 639/2026

Arising out of Complaint Case No.- 13/2017

<u>page-2</u> Contd. 22.07.2026	4. Ramkaran Sah. He stated that his grandfather and his father had already partitioned their properties during their lifetime. Further he attaining majority, the complainant started living separately from his father while Late Adhik Sah continued to reside with the petitioner. Further he stated that the petitioner and his wife Triveni Devi looked after and cared his grandfather until his lifetime. Further he stated that his grandfather has approximately 50 bighas of land. Further he stated that his grandfather being pleased with the care and services rendered by the complainant and his wife, Late Adhik Sah executed two registered sale deeds in favour of the petitioner's wife Triveni Devi for vaulable consideration by sale deed no.-18879 of 1979, his grandfather transferred 5 bighas, 3 khatta and 10 dhurs of land and by sale deed no.-18880 of 1979, transferred 5 bigha 7 dhur of land. Thus a total of 10 bigha 3 khatta and 17 dhur of land was registered in her favour on 27.12.1979. Thereafter complainant's and his wife came into possession of the land covered by the sale deed and began cultivating it, producing crops and enjoying the produce thereof. Further he stated that his brothers in collusion with the revenue employees and officials of the Circle Office, Simri Bakhtiyarpur fraudlently manipulated jamabandi no.-4 relating to the land situated in hariraho mauza. It is alleged that they tampered with the jamabandi register by deleting the name of Late Adhik Sah. His brother stated that preparing forged entries in the jamabandi register fraudlently transferred the complainant's land in favour of accused petitioners through a registered sale deed dated 30.11.2016. He stated that land in recorded khata no.- 232, however, his brothers by committing executed the sale deed in favour of accused petitioners by by incorrectly mentioning khata no.-224 instead of khata no.-232 and by changing the old	
---------------------------------------	---	--

ABA No.- 639/2026

Arising out of Complaint Case No.- 13/2017

<u>Page-3</u> contd. 22.07.2026	khata no.-7 to khata no.-6. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. Further he submitted that petitioner no.-1, 2 and 3 are having one antecedent vide Mahishi PS Case No.-07 of 2017 which they are on bail and petitioner no.-4 is having clean antecedent and further he submitted that earlier petitioners have not filed any application for bail in this Court or before the Hon'ble High Court. Further he submitted that petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case. Further he submitted that petitioners are purchased a land by the co-accused Jairam Sah and others. Further he submitted that petitioners are purchaser so his right is first but the complainant booked the petitioner only on putting pressure for scraching the land. Lastly, it is submitted that the Petitioners are man of means and there is no chance of their absconding or tampering with the evidence in this case. Hence, the prayer for bail may be allowed. On the contrary learned A.P.P. opposed the prayer for bail. 5. I have heard the rival submission of both parties. Perused the case record. On perusal of the record it appears that the petitioners are vendee of sale deed no.-4189 dated 30.11.2016 and they had acquired the land of old khata no.-224, new khata no.-6, old plot no.-927, new plot no.-1199 and 1202 after paying consideration amount to the vendor. Moreover vendor of the sale deed no.-4189 had executed and registered sale deed in favour of these petitioners by claiming his own land which fallen in their share by way of partition among the members of the family. Further the seller of the sale deed no.-4189 have been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 02.05.2019 in Cri. Misc. No.-28517 of 2019. The	
---------------------------------------	---	--

COURT OF DISTRICT & ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- IIIrd, SAHARSA

ABA No.- 639/2026

Arising out of Complaint Case No.- 13/2017

<u>Page-4</u> contd. 22.07.2026	disputes appears to be predominantly civil in nature. 6. Considering the fact and circumstances discussed above anticipatory bail petition of 1. Ram Pravesh sah, 2. Gopi Sah, 3. Sibu Sah and 4. Ramdhan Sah is allowed and it is ordered that in the event of arrest/surrender they will be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/-(ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each within four weeks of the receipt of this order to the satisfaction of the learned court below subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) BNSS. (Dictated & corrected by me) Sd/- I/C District & Addl. Sessions Judge III	