

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.31716 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -2798 Year- 2012 Thana -MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- MUZAFFARPUR

=====

1. Ranjit Kumar @ Tullu @ Ranjeet Kumar Son of Late Nawal Kishore Prasad Singh @ Late Nawal Kishore Prasad resident of village Ramraji Road, Maripur, P.S. - Kaji Mohammadpur, District Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar. null
2. Ajay Singh Son of Bindeshwari Singh resident of Mohalla - Nayatola, Krishnapuri, P.S. Kazimohammadpur, District Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Smt. Sharda Kumari

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-11-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State assisted by learned counsel, appearing for the complainant.

The accusation against the petitioner is that he took Rs. 3,40,000/- from the complainant and in lieu thereof, he gave a cheque but when the complainant presented the aforesaid cheque, the said cheque became bounced due to insufficient money in the account of the petitioner.

The petitioner earlier came before this court, seeking privilege of anticipatory bail and he was granted privilege of anticipatory bail vide order dated 01-07-2014 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 11994 of 2014 subject to condition that he would deposit the

amount in question but the petitioner failed to deposit the amount in question and accordingly, he was remanded in the case on 18-06-2016 and, thereafter, he filed this petition which was placed before this bench on 16-08-2016 and on the above-said date, this court issued notice to opposite party No. 2 and accordingly, provisional bail was granted to the petitioner.

Submission on behalf of petitioner is that in course of inquiry, the complainant admitted this fact that there is no document to show the above-said transaction, as alleged in the complaint petition. It is further submitted that even if, prosecution story assumed to be true, then also, the petitioner has sufficiently been punished by remaining in jail custody for near about two months.

Considering the above-said facts and circumstances of the case as well as submission of the parties, the provisional bail granted to the petitioner by order dated 16-08-2016 is, hereby, confirmed and accordingly, this petition stands disposed off.

However, the concerned court must expedite the trial of the petitioner and try to conclude the same as early as possible.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

A.K.V./-

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