

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44061 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -732 Year- 2016 Thana -SASARAM NAGAR District- SASARAM
(ROHTAS)

=====

Dhanjeet Kumar, S/o Harihar Ram, Resident of Village-Lengar Kekai, P.S.-
Chenari, District-Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Syed Mohammad Shabbir Alam, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Gopesh Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 17-10-2016

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Sasaram (Model) P.S. Case No. 732 of 2016 dated 28.06.2016
instituted under Sections 406/420/120(B)/467/468 of the Indian Penal
Code.

The allegation against the petitioner is that a forged and
fabricated cheque of Rs. 3,00,000/- was credited in his account.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has
no connection with any forgery as the cheque was given to him by
Ravi Ranjan, who was the friend of the younger brother of the
petitioner namely, Sunil Kumar, on the pretext that he had got some
money for the marriage of his sister, which, due to him not having a



Bank account, was requested to be deposited in the account of the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that in good faith, the cheque was deposited in the account of the petitioner wherefrom through ATM Rs. 1.5 lakhs was also withdrawn and given to Ravi Ranjan. It is submitted that the remaining amount is still lying in the Bank account which has been frozen by the police. Learned counsel submits that there is absolutely no connection of the petitioner to the entire episode as it was Ravi Ranjan, who had given the cheque and to whom part of the money was given and it is also a fact that the sister of Ravi Ranjan was getting marriage.

Learned A.P.P. submits that the admitted position being that Rs. 3,00,000/- from the account of the father of the informant was credited in the account of the petitioner from a cheque issued from the account of the father of the informant, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer is rejected.

However, in the event the petitioner surrenders before the Court below and seeks regular bail within one month from today, the same shall be considered on its own merits taking into account all

the points raised on behalf of the petitioner, including the bail granted to co-accused, without being prejudiced by the present order.

(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)

P. Kumar

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