

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.43447 of 2016

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -66 Year- 2016 Thana -C.B.I CASE District- MUZAFFARPUR

=====

1. HANUMAN RAM, son of late Sita Ram, resident of village- Panch Pokhari, P.S.- Kudra, District- Kaimur, Bhabhua.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State through Vigilance, Bihar, Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Babita Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, L.O.,I/C Vigilance

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

4/ 12-01-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The Petitioner seeks bail in Vigilance P.S. Case No.66 of 2016 instituted for the offence under Section(s) 7, 13(2) read with 13(1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

The prosecution case, in short, is that when Sampat Bhagat, complained alleging that the petitioner, who was the supervising authority of Asaon P.S. Case No.63 of 2016, demanded a sum of rupees fifty thousand for giving supervision note in his favour, one Tarni Prasad Yadav, Dy. Superintendent of Police-cum-In charge raiding party, Vigilance Bureau, lodged written report dated 13.07.2016, addressed to the Superintendent of Police, Vigilance, that on 12.07.2016 the accused Hanuman



Ram was caught red handed taking bribe of rupees fifty thousand from Sampat Bhagat and, accordingly, accused was arrested.

Case Dairy has been received. In para 9, 10 and 12, the Investigating Officer has given in detail about the notes recovered from the possession of this petitioner. The Investigating Officer has mentioned in para 12 that besides the aforesaid amount, a sum of rupees two lacs forty five thousand was further recovered from beneath the bed of the petitioner in the room for which he could not give any explanation. The witnesses in para 13, 14, 15, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 42 have also supported the allegation of recovery of rupees fifty thousand from the petitioner and rupees two lacs forty five thousand from beneath his bed. The police has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner as mentioned in para 62 of the Case Diary.

In view of such, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

Prayer of the petitioner for bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

JA/-

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

