

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.41946 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -27 Year- 2015 Thana -AMNAUR District- SARAN

=====

Ranjay Kumar Pathak @ Sanjay Kumar Pathak Son of Late Mahesh Pathak
Resident of Village- Bhatgiee, Police Station- Amnour, District- Saran at
Chapra.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Ban Bihari Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Shyam Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KISHORE KUMAR
MANDAL
ORAL ORDER

4 05-12-2016 Heard the counsel for the petitioner, the informant as
well as the State.

The petitioner prays for bail in Amnour P.S. Case
No. 27 of 2015 registered under sections 420 & 406 IPC
including section 138 of N.I. Act.

The informant/complainant lodged the case alleging
that he was the In-charge Officer of the Customer Service
Centre of the SBI whereas the petitioner was employed by
the Customer Service Centre to collect money and deposit
with the informant or the Bank. The allegation is that the
petitioner collected Rs. 3,48,000/- from different depositors
of the Bank, but did not deposit the same.



It is stated that no depositor has raised any grievance against the petitioner with regard to collection of the amount and non-deposit thereof. The petitioner is in custody since 08.08.2016. One of the co-accuseds of this case namely Ramesh Prasad Yadav has since been released on bail by the learned court below. The case of the petitioner stands on identical/similar footing.

Counsel for the informant as well as the State point out that the petitioner had filed an anticipatory bail application. On the condition of payment of the defalcated amount, he was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail. The cheque issued by the petitioner was dishonoured. Referring to few paragraphs of the case diary, it is pointed out that some of the depositors have stated about the criminal role of the petitioner. The petitioner did not submit to the jurisdiction of the court promptly.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court, for the present, is not inclined to extend the petitioner the privilege of bail. Prayer is rejected.

The petitioner shall have liberty to renew his prayer for bail in the court below after the charges are framed which



shall be considered and disposed of on its own merit in
accordance with law.

(Kishore Kumar Mandal, J)

HR/-

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

