

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.579 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- PATNA

=====

Sone Lal Sahni son of Late Dahaur Sahni, resident of West of Aprajeeta Apartment
Agam Kuan Thana Road, P.O. - Bahadurpur Housing Colony, P.S. - Agam Kuan,
District - Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Commissioner Department of Vigilance, Bihar.
2. The Superintendent of Police Vigilance, Investigation Bureau, Patna -Cum-
Investigating Officer of the present Case.
3. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Investigating Bureau, Patna.
4. The Investigating Officer, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Patna.
5. Jai Prakash University, Chapra through its Registrar, District - Saran.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyameshwar Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Law Officer, I/C Vigilance

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR SINGH
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 02-02-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for
the Vigilance and learned counsel for the Jai Prakash University,
Chapra.

2. By way of the present application under Articles 226 and
227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks quashing of the
first information report of Vigilance P.S. Case No.10 of 2015
registered under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 479A/34 and 120B
of the Indian Penal Code as well as Sections 12(1)(d) and 13(2) of the
Prevention of Corruption Act.

3. It has been contended that by the learned counsel for the

petitioner that though the petitioner is named in the first information report, till date no incriminating material has been collected by the investigating agency against him.

4. Learned counsel for the Vigilance has contended that the allegations made in the first information report are quite serious and investigation is still in progress.

5. Be that as it may, I have perused the allegations made in the first information report. The allegations do attract ingredients of a cognizable offence.

6. The investigation of a criminal case is confidential in nature. Hence, the contention of the petitioner that no incriminating material has been collected against him till date is misconceived. Moreover, in the FIR itself serious allegations of financial irregularities have been levelled against the petitioner.

7. In that view of the matter, I find no merit in the present application. Accordingly, the application is dismissed.

(Ashwani Kumar Singh, J)

Md.S./-

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