

In the Court of Additional Sessions Judge-III, Muzaffarpur
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 2701/2026

(Arising out of Katra P. S. Case No. 64/2018)

In the matter of:

1. Bipul Kumar Singh, S/o – Raghubir Singh, aged about – 53 yrs,
Resident of village – Chhapra, P. S. - Chhapra,
District - SheoharPetitioner

Versus

State of Bihar : Opposite Party

Appearance(s)

Counsel for the Petitioner(s) : Ram Naresh Mishra, Advocate

: Dewarshi, Advocate

Counsel for the State : Sangita Sahi, Addl. PP.

Present: Suman Kumar Divakar

Bihar Superior Judicial Service

Order

05-08-2026

1. The Petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in connection with Katra P. S. Case No. 64/2018 registered for the offences under Section 467, 468, 420, 120(B), 34 of Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as 'IPC' for short).
2. It is placed on record that earlier the petitioner had filed ABP No. 2162/2026. The same was dismissed being withdrawn. Hence, the present petition is being considered on merits.
3. Briefly stated, the prosecution has alleged that in the first round, the accused sold the land to the informant (Lal Babu Singh) and again out of the said land, some portion to the extent of 3.25 decimal sold to Sintu Singh. It is further alleged that when Murli Manohar Singh was selling land to the Sintu Singh, the present petitioner was identifier.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is only the identifier in the sale deed executed to Sintu Singh and the said sale deed is still intact and mutation also done in favour of the Sintu Singh. He further submits that the present petitioner has not derived any benefit from the transaction. Being a villager he became identifier in the sale deed. He had no knowledge of any previous transaction with regard to the said piece of land as alleged

in the FIR. He further submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedent related to liquor drinking. In this backdrop, he prays for Anticipatory Bail.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer so made on behalf of the petitioner.
6. Heard the parties. Considered the submissions. Perused the material on record including case diary. It appears from the record that petitioner is only identifier to the transaction took place between Murli Manohar Singh and Sintu Singh. He does not appear to be direct beneficiary of the transaction. The investigation is still in progress. Thus, considering the nature of allegation levelled against the petitioner and his alleged role of being identifier and further co-accused Sintu Singh has been given Anticipatory Bail by the learned predecessor of this court, I am inclined to extend him the privilege of pre-arrest bail. In the result, the present petition stands **allowed**.
7. It is ordered that the petitioner above named would be enlarged on bail either in event of arrest or after being surrendered before the court concerned within 15 days from the date of this order on furnishing bail bonds of rupees 10,000/- of two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned. And further condition as stipulated under Section 482(2) BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973).

Sd/-

(Suman Kumar Divakar)
Additional Sessions Judge-III
Muzaffarpur