IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.37143 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -27 Year- 2015 Thana -AMNAUR District- SARAN

==========

1. Ramesh Prasad Yadav, son of Late Dahal Rai Resident of village Dharampura thekhi, Police Station Marhaura, District Saran at Chapra.
2. Ranjay Kumar Pathak son of Late Mahesh Pathak Resident of village Bhatgaee, Police Station Amnaur District Saran at Chapra.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

==========

WEB COPY NOT OFFICIAL

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Chandra Sahni(App)

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

4 15-12-2015 Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Amnaur P.S. Case No. 27/2015, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406 of the Indian Penal Code and 138 of the N.I. Act.

The case was sent to the Mediation Centre for compromise, but the mediator reported that no compromise is done. The informant filed a complaint petition stating that both the petitioners were working under the informant in Customer Service Centre, Jalalpur. It is alleged that the petitioners took money from the customers and misappropriated the amount. In lieu there of, the petitioners issued eight cheques of Rs. 3,48,000/-, but the cheques were bounced.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners were not working at the customer service centre of the informant. The petitioners also applied and run customer service centre. There is a business rivalry. The petitioners issued cheques on mutual understanding with each other and no money is defalcated by the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the informant as well as learned Additional P.P. vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

It appears that there is allegation that the petitioners were working under the complainant at customer service centre, used to collect money, but petitioners did not deposit the same in the Bank. On demand, the petitioners issued eight cheques worth Rs. 3,48,000/- and all the cheques were dishonoured.

Having considered the facts that the petitioners in stead of depositing the money of the customer, misappropriated the same, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

Rakhi

U		T	