

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.28266 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -47 Year- 2015 Thana -KOCHAS District- SASARAM (ROHTAS)

Nilesh Chandra Son of Praduman Chandra, Manager, GTFS Multi Service Limited, Sasaram, District- Rohtas, Resident of Town, PO & PS- Jhalda, District- Purulia, (West Bengal)

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Bajarangi Lal, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

5 10-11-2016 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Kochas (Parsathua O.P.) P.S. Case No. 47 of 2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 406, 420 and other Sections of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that her husband died in an accident on 27.07.2007 and she was to get Rs. 5,00,000/- for accident insurance from G.I.C. The petitioner being the manager of the insurance company assured her to make all the payments but forced her to establish physical relation with her. It is further alleged that even after transfer the petitioner continued to force her to marry with him.

Sri Bajarangi Lal, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the entire allegation is false and concocted. The petitioner was transferred from the branch of G.I.C. Sasaram in the year 2012 to the

branch situated at Baharaich in U.P. The case was filed after three years after his transfer. During course of investigation the investigating officer has not collected any material to show that any obscene photograph of the informant and her daughter was put on facebook. The informant, herself, compromised the case by filing a petition on 24.05.2016 before the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram in Kochas (Parsathua O.P.) P.S. Case No. 47 of 2015, but it appears that the informant has very categorically stated that the petitioner being the branch manager of General Insurance Company forced the informant to have physical relation with him for payment of insurance, even after transfer of the petitioner the petitioner made contact with her and he forced the informant to marry with him.

Considering the nature of allegations made against the petitioner, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

However, the petitioner, if so advised, may surrender before the court below within four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order and pray for regular bail, his prayer shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

KKSINHA/-

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