



In the Court of **PUNEET KUMAR GARG**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
A.B.P No. 2662 of 2026 (Complaint Case No. 3954/2019, Trial No. 144/2026)

Neha Shrivastwa & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	19.06.2026	1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Neha Shrivastawa</i> and <i>ii. Vishal Kumar @ Chandan</i>, apprehending their arrest in this Complaint Case No. 3954/2019, registered under Section 406 of the BNS and Section 138 of N.I. Act, pending in the Court of <i>Shri Sanchit Kumar</i>, learned JMSC, Saran at Chapra. 2. Case has been registered on the basis of a complaint petition of the complainant, namely, <i>Harisharan Prasad</i>, stating that on 02.08.2019, the petitioner-accused purchased tea leaves worth Rs. 87,200/- from the complainant's shop and handed over a cheque of Rs. 27,200/- issued in the name of his wife, <i>Neha Shrivastwa</i>, assuring that the remaining amount of Rs. 60,000/- would be paid within fifteen days. It is alleged that the petitioner-accused informed the complainant that sufficient funds were available in the account and requested him to retain the cheque. However, when the cheque was presented for encashment, it was dishonoured due to insufficient funds. Despite service of legal notice, the accused failed to make payment. 3. It is contended on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioners-accused that they are quite innocent and have not committed any offence as alleged in F.I.R. Next contended that earlier no ABP or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioners-accused in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case and they have got clean antecedent, except this one. Next contended that the petitioners-accused have falsely been implicated in this case due to misunderstanding and confusion. Next added that all the allegations levelled against the petitioners-accused are false, baseless and concocted. Next asserted that the case has amicably been compromised between the parties, and a compromise petition duly signed by both the parties has also been brought on the record. Further submitted that the petitioners-accused are ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioners-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail. 4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners-accused.	



In the Court of **PUNEET KUMAR GARG**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
A.B.P No. 2662 of 2026 (Complaint Case No. 3954/2019, Trial No. 144/2026)

Neha Shrivastwa & Anr. V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

		5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the same, it appears that the dispute between the parties has amicably been resolved and they have entered into compromise, and a compromise petition, duly signed by both the parties has also been brought on the record. Good sense has prevailed between both the parties through mutual compromise. 6. So, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the compromise between the parties, absence of criminal antecedent, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, this Anticipatory Bail Petition, bearing No. 2662 of 2026, is hereby allowed. In the event of their arrest or surrender within one month from this order, the petitioners-accused, namely, <i>i. Neha Shrivastawa and ii. Vishal Kumar @ Chandan</i>, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- <u>each with two sureties</u> of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of B.N.S.S., 2023 :- (I) That the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by I.O., as and when required, (II) That the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the I.O. of the case, (III) That the petitioners shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court, (IV) That the petitioners are directed to co-operate in trial and disposal of the case. [Dictated] (Puneet Kumar Garg), Sessions Judge, Saran 19.06.2026	