

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.11074 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -264 Year- 2016 Thana -MITHANPURA District- MUZAFFARPUR

=====

Amit Kumar Rao, son of Late Bindeshwar Prasad, Resident of house No. 87A, Mohalla Parti Tola, Kalyani, P.S. Mithanpura, District-Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar,
2. Cluster Branch Manager, I.C.I.C.I Bank, Main Branch, Sinha Complex, Jubha Sahri Park, Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Parasmani

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

5 18-09-2017 Heard leaned counsel for the petitioner and the leaned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehend his arrest in connection with Mithanpura P.S. Case No. 264 of 2016, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 379/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66 of the I.T. Act, pending in the court of the S.D.J.M. East Muzaffarpur.

The allegation of informant Cluster Branch Manager of I.C.I.C.I Bank, Main Branch, Sinha Complex, Jubha Sahri Park, Muzaffarpur is that on 23.10.2016 one account holder, namely, Kiran Devi made complaint that she deposited a cheque in I.C.I.C.I Bank in her account which is cleared by the Central Bank, but the amount has not been credited in her account, when enquiry was made then he found irregularities in several accounts



and it has come in light that petitioner, who is vendor of Urway Protfolio Management Pvt. Ltd. engaged in clearing the cheques to the clearing house managed to bring the cash to several banks in accounts of accounts holders and got deposited in his account the accounts of his relative. On enquiry, the petitioner did not give any satisfactory reply about depositing of Rs. 80,75,109/- in his account and the account of his relative on transfer.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not the employee in the I.C.I.C.I Bank rather he was employed by other agency to collect the cheques to cheque clearance house and he has falsely been implicated in this case.

Learned A.P.P. submits that it has come in paragraph Nos.3 and 4 of the case diary that Rs. 35,000/- has been credited in the personal account of the petitioner and some amounts and also in the account of his relatives.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of allegation against the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

