

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.4583 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -19 Year- 2016 Thana -KOCHAS District- SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

1. Pradeep Kumar, Son of Dr. Permanand Singh, Resident of Village-Kochas, P.S. Kochas, District- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Sanjeev Kumar, Son of Sri Rajbansh Singh, Resident of Village Katiyara, P.S. Dinara, District- Rohtas.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhruv Narayan, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Jitendra Prasad Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anand Mohan Prasad Mehta

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 21-03-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in Kochas P.S. Case No. 19/2016, instituted for the offence under Section(s) 406 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 138 of the N.I. Act.

The allegation against this petitioner is that he along with other accused persons started business of chit-fund financial company, namely, Bonanza Portfolio Limited in the month of September, 2012 in Subham Market, Kochas, Rohtas. The petitioner was the Incharge of the branch. It is alleged that the petitioner and other accused persons assured the local people to invest money in his company, which will be refunded along with 15% compound interest. The complainant deposited money till October, 2014 and



when he wanted to withdraw the money, the petitioner issued cheque for Rs. 8,50,000/- which was deposited by the complainant, but the same was dishonoured. The complainant issued legal notice to the petitioner, but the amount was not paid.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that he has been granted bail in four other cases filed by different consumers for issuance of cheque in their favour.

From perusal of the orders it appears that the petitioner cheated many persons. The case diary has been received wherein the witnesses in para 6 has stated that the Bank gave information that the petitioner has neither any account nor any amount in his account. Further it appears that such type of cheating has been done by this petitioner with several other persons also. He issued cheques to them and cheques were dishonoured.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner, above named, on bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after nine months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, in the event no substantive progress is made in the trial. The lower court is directed to expedite the trial.

(Sanjay Priya, J.)

Rakhi

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

