

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.1877 of 2015

Arising out of PS.Case No. -22 Year- 2013 Thana -ECONOMIC OFFENCE District-
MUZAFFARPUR

=====

Ramadhar Ram, Son of Late Magani Ram, Resident of Birsa Nagar, Chhota
Bariyarpur, P.S. Chhatauni, District Motihari East Champaran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar, through Vigilance.

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Shri Alamdar Hussain, Sr. Advocate
Shri Dharmendra Kr. Paswan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party : Shri Ramakant Sharma (L.O.,I/C,Vigi.)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE SHRI JUSTICE DHARNIDHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 16-07-2015

Heard Shri Alamdar Hussain, the learned senior
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. None appears for
the Vigilance Department.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in Patna Economic
Offences P.S. Case No. 22 of 2013 under Section 13(2) read with
Section 13(1)(e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.
Undisputedly the petitioner was Executive Engineer in the Public
Health Engineering Division, Siwan. It appears from the First
Information Report that the police raided the official and personal
premises of the petitioner to make recoveries of different
incriminating documents and it made out a case that the petitioner
had amassed property to the tune of Rs. 34,50,000/-. The
allegation further was that the properties were acquired/invested
in the names of his children and near relatives, like, son-in-laws.

The submission is that the two daughters of the

petitioner were married and as may appear from the very First Information Report, one of the son-in-laws of the petitioner was employed as Siksha Mitra in the district of Sitamarhi. It was contended that the other son-in-law was running a brick kiln. It is also contended that the son of the petitioner was living separate from the petitioner and he had his own earnings and assets.

On going through the written report, what appears is that one of son-in-laws was a Siksha Mitra and as information goes, he should be a lowly paid *ad hoc* employee of the State under the Panchayati Raj system. There is no mention in the First Information Report as to the assets of the second son-in-law of the petitioner but what is alleged was that the son-in-law of the petitioner was appointed by the petitioner as his own driver. Submission at the end of the hearing was that the petitioner being a public servant is supposed to co-operate with the investigating agency and, as such, it was required that his personal liberty be protected.

Regard being had to the allegations which had appeared against the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Prayer is dismissed.

(Dharnidhar Jha, J.)

Sanjay/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--