

Sl. No.	Date of order of proceeding	Order with the signature of the Court	Office action taken with date
---------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------

		In the Court of Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi <u>A.B.P. No. 2099 of 2026</u> <u>Arising out of Lalpur P.S. Case No.172/26</u> CNR No.- JHRNO10093282026 Name of Accused Petitioners : Subodh Kumar Singh @ Bhola Kumar & ors Name of informant : Sunil Singh Learned counsel for the petitioner : Sri Avinash Kumar Pandey, Ld. Adv. Learned counsel for prosecution : Ms. Mini Lakra, Ld. P.P	
	14.8.2026	The application for anticipatory bail has been filed by petitioners namely (1) Subodh Kumar Singh @ Bhola Kumar, (2) Abhimanyu Kumar Verman, (3) Sumit Kumar Verman who are apprehending their arrest in connection with <u>Lalpur P.S. Case No.172/26</u>, under Section 318(4), 316(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and learned P.P for the State. Prosecution case as disclosed in the written report of informant Sunil Singh, in short, is that the informant, who is engaged in the transport business, came into contact with accused Abhimanyu Kumar Verma, who represented that he dealt in bank-seized vehicles. A deal was settled for an 18-wheeler trailer bearing Reg. No.JH05EA7731 for Rs.35 lakh. Pursuant to the deal, the informant paid Rs.21,000/- in cash and transferred Rs.8 lakh through RTS to the account of Abhimanyu Kumar Verma. Further, about Rs.1.79 lakh was transferred to the account of his brother, Sumit Kumar Verma. It is alleged that the vehicle was shown to the informant through co-accused Bhola Kumar, but the vehicle was never delivered. In total, about Rs.10 lakh was paid to the accused persons. When the informant demanded cancellation of the deal and refund of the money, the accused persons allegedly refused. Subsequently, Sumit Kumar Verma returned a part of the amount, but the remaining amount was not refunded. Hence present case was lodged. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits tht the petitoners are innocent and have committed no offence as alleged in the written report. It is sbmitted that the dispute bttween the parties is contracual in nature and arises out of a transaction between them. It is further submitted that the petitioner had jointly refunded a sum of Rs.4 lakh to the informant towards full and final settlement of the disptue between the parties. It is also submitted that the petitioners came	

Sl. No.	Date of order of proceeding	Order with the signature of the Court	Office action taken with date
	<u>Contd...2</u> 14.8.2026	to know about the registration of the present case only upon receipt of notice under Section 35(3) BNSS. In compliance thereof, they have appeared and cooperated with the investigation. Hence they may be enlarged on anticipatory bail. Learned P.P. opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the taking into seriousness of offence, the bail petition filed on behalf of accused petitioners is fit to be rejected. Upon consideration of the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and on perusal of the materials availavble on record, it prima facie appears that the dispute between the parties is commercial in nature and relates to recovery/realisation of money. It further appears that the petitoners had paid certain amounts to the informant. The petitioners have complied with the notice issued under Section 35(3) of the BNSS and have undertaken to cooperate with the investigation. Considering the nature of allegations, the stage of the case, and the conduct of the petitioners, their custodial interrogation does not appear to be necessary at this stage. Considering the aforesaid facts as discussed herein above, I am inclined to allow the application for anticipatory bail. Accordingly the petitioners in the event of arrest or surrender before the Court below within two weeks from today, are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C subject to the condition that the petitioners shall cooperate in the investigation as and when required by the I.O failing with the I.O is at liberty to move through learned P.P for cancellation of bail. (Dictated) sd/- (Anil Kumar Mishra No.1) Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi. J.O.Code:JH00398 Order uploaded on 17.8.2026	