

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.58060 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -23 Year- 2012 Thana -ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR District-
PATNA

=====

1. Sanjeev Kumar S/o Bhagan Mahto Resident of Village - Prem Tola, P.S.
- Godda, District - Godda (Jharkhand)

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Priyank Deepak

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Indivar Kumari(APP)

For Economic Offence : Mr. Vishwanath Pd. Sinha, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH

ORAL ORDER

3 30-01-2016 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State.

This application for grant of anticipatory bail arises out
of Economic Offences P.S. Case No. 23 of 2012, disclosing
offences under Sections 420,468,472 and 120B of the Indian Penal
Code.

The prosecution case contains interpolations in O.M.R.
Answer-sheets of the examination held by the Bihar Staff
Selection Commission for appointment to the post of Junior
Engineers, as a part of huge appointment racket. The petitioner
was admittedly, an examinee and interpolations have been found
in his O.M.R. sheet also.



Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report and nothing incriminating has been recovered from his possession. He has drawn my attention to the orders passed by this Court dated 12.12.2013 and 11.04.2014 in Cr. Misc. No. 20999 of 2013 and Cr. Misc. No. 18696 of 2014 in order to contend that the similarly persons, who were named in the First Information Report have been granted anticipatory bail.

Mr. Vishwanath Prasad Sinha, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of Economic Offences Unit has, on the other hand, submitted that it was a part of big conspiracy in which the petitioner and other persons engaged themselves in interpolation of O.M. R. sheets. He has submitted that several persons who have not been named in the First Information Report had approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail, which came to be rejected by various orders.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the petitioner's custodial interrogation may be required, I am not inclined to grant him the privilege of anticipatory bail, particularly when this Court has refused grant of such privilege in various cases.

This application is, accordingly, rejected.

The petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court below within six weeks and seek regular bail, if so advised. If he does so, his application for regular bail shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by rejection of present application for grant of anticipatory bail.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

ArunKumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--