

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.16634 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -138 Year- 2015 Thana -MAKER District- SARAN

=====

Lallan Ram @ Lalan Ram, Son of Late Natha Ram, Resident of Village-
Bhetwalia, P.S. Maker, Distt Saran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance:

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR
JHA

ORAL ORDER

3 09-05-2017 Heard both sides.

The petitioner seeks bail in Maker P.S. Case No. 138
of 2015 registered under Sections 467, 468, 471, 409 and 420 of
the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that he opened Customers
Service Kendra (C.S.C.) of Bank of India, in which the informant
was authorized to open account of the customers with facility to
deposit and withdraw money. The informant employed the
petitioner, but the petitioner made interpolations in the bank
account of different customers and thereby he defalcated and
misappropriated more than Rs. 20 lakhs from the account of
different customers.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Md.



Nashim, one of the customers, filed a complaint case No. 473 of 2016, on the basis of which, Maker P. S. Case No. 106 of 2016 was registered. Md. Nashim made Ram Naresh Pandit, the informant of the present case, accused along with the petitioner Lallan Ram. It is submitted that the petitioner is simply an employee and he did not open any account of the customers. The informant himself misappropriated the amount and implicated the petitioner by filing a false case. But on perusal of the case diary, it appears that the informant made specific allegation that while he was suffering from jaundice, he entrusted the entire work of Grahak Seva Kendra to the petitioner and the petitioner made different illegalities and opened accounts in the name of the different persons. The petitioner without the consent of the account holder put his thumb impression as identification in different accounts and he withdrew Rs. 20 lakhs from the account of the different customers.

Considering the facts aforesaid, I am no inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

Mishra/-

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

