

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No. 39148 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -33 Year- 2016 Thana -SAHEBPURKAMAL District- BEGUSARAI

=====

Upendra Sah Son of Late Bishwanath Sah Resident of Village - Chakla,
Purvi Bazar, P.S. - Simri Bakhtiyarpur, District - Saharsa. At present
resident of village - Kurha, P.S. - Sahebpurkamal, District - Begusarai.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sandip Kumar Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2. 21-09-2016 Heard Sri Sandip Kumar Gautam, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Sri Ram Bilash Roy Raman, learned Addl.
Public Prosecutor.

The sole petitioner, apprehending his arrest in
Sahebpurkamal P.S. Case No. 33 of 2016 registered for offence
under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B), 34, 379, 506, 323 of
the Indian Penal Code, has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

By way of referring to F.I.R., it was submitted by
learned counsel for the petitioner that save and except the fact that
petitioner is father of one of the main accused, there is no other
accusation. He submits that only with a view to put pressure,
petitioner has been made accused alongwith his son. He further
submits that the petitioner is in central government job. Learned

counsel for the petitioner has argued that on going through the F.I.R., it is evident that informant had noticed regarding commission of offence on 30-09-2015, whereas, F.I.R. was lodged belatedly on 06-03-2016.

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor has opposed the prayer for bail.

Besides hearing, I have also perused the F.I.R. On going through the same, it is evident that informant was primarily cheated by son of the petitioner for providing employment in the central government. In the F.I.R. itself, it has been indicated that to justify the action, the son of the petitioner had provided telephonic talk of informant with the petitioner. It is evident that the informant was cheated to the tune of Rs. 3,00,000/- (three lacs) and he was also provided a forged appointment letter.

In view of nature of accusation, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J.)

Anay

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