

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.34133 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -229 Year- 2017 Thana -SIWAN MUFFASIL District- SIWAN

=====

Shivji Pandit @ Shiv Jee Pandit, son of Manager Pandit, resident of village
Jagarnathpur, P.S. Jamo Bazar, District Siwan. Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
 2. The Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar, Patna.
- Opposite Parties.
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Prasad Singh

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAKASH CHANDRA
JAISWAL**

ORAL ORDER

02 20-07-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

Petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Special Case No.19 of 2017 registered for the alleged offences
under Section 420/120B of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along with
two other persons are said to have visited the residence of the
informant A.S.I. to bribe him and the S.D.P.O. to change the
supervision note of Panchrukhi P.S. Case No.102 of 2017 in
favour of the accused persons of the said case and petitioner was
arrested with Rs.1,15,000.00.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the
petitioner that the petitioner has no concern with the accused
persons of Panchrukhi P.S. Case No.102 of 2017. He is not



accused in the said case. As a matter of fact, he had gone to do marketing taking the aforesaid money on the occasion of marriage of his daughter and has been arrested by the police and roped in this case without any rhyme and reason. He has been languishing in custody since 30.06.2017.

On the other hand, Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the Vigilance Investigation Bureau, has vehemently opposed the bail petition and submitted that Rs.1,15,000.00 was recovered from the possession of the petitioner which he had taken to bribe the informant and the S.D.P.O. to write the supervision note in favour of the accused persons of Panchrukhi P.S. Case No.102 of 2017.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. However, he may renew his prayer for bail after four months or after framing of charge, whichever is earlier.

(Prakash Chandra Jaiswal, J.)

Trivedi/-

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

