

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.27597 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -59 Year- 2011 Thana -JAMHORA District- AURANGABAD

=====

Ranjan Kumar Singh son of Late Kamla Singh resident of Village- Rajpur,
Police Station- Mali, District- Aurangabad.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Kamendra Pd. Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Amit Kumar Rakesh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 30-08-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with a
case registered for the offences punishable under Sections
420/406/120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner
is one of the Advisors of the Company known as OCPL in which
Investments were being taken by the present petitioner as well as
the complainant for being deposited with the Branch Manager of
the said Company. It is further submitted that when the said
OCPL Company did not repay the maturity amount of the
depositors, the present petitioner told the complainant that the
directors of the Company were visiting the branch office and
payments of the depositors would be made shortly after meeting with
them. However, such a meeting never took place and, therefore,



the present complainant has filed the case against the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the main allegation is against the directors of the Company and not against these petitioners as they had merely acted in their duty as advisors in order to manage the business of the Company in the concerned area. The complainant as well as the petitioner are similarly placed and there is no offence made out against the present petitioner.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State, it appears that there was some dispute between the depositors and director of the Company. However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that directors of the Company have since been extended the privilege of anticipatory bail in Cr. Misc. No. 24083 of 2016 and its analogous case vide order dated 16.08.2016.

Considering the nature of allegations made and that the main accused of this case have been extended the privilege of anticipatory bail and also because this petitioner has no criminal antecedent, let the petitioner, in the event of his arrest / surrender within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial

Magistrate, Aurangabad in connection with Jamhor P.S. Case No.
59 of 2011, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section
438(2) of the Cr. P.C.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Saif/-

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