

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.14862 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -6 Year- 2016 Thana -HARSIDHI District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

=====

Sunil Kumar, Son of Rajendra Ram, Resident of Village Maldviya, P.S.-
Paharpur, District- East Champaran.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kamlesh Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party : Ms. Sahin Begam, APP.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-04-2017 Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Harsidhi P.S.
Case No. 6 of 2016 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 406, 420 and other Sections of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant alleged that he and Brajesh Kumar gave
Rs. 2,09,000/- and Rs. 2,95,000/- respectively to the accused Sunil
Kumar on his assurance to provide them job of clerk in the health
department.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that prayer
for bail of the petitioner was earlier rejected vide order dated
22.11.2016 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 29800 of 2016 but, some facts
left out to be brought on record. The petitioner also filed a
Complaint Case No. 2395 of 2015 against the informant and
others alleging therein that the accused persons took money from



him for selling a piece of land but, Dipak Kumar and others did not purchase the land. In the aforesaid complaint case, after enquiry, sufficient material under Sections 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code was found. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is ready to return the money subject to the result of the case but, from perusal of the records, it appears that prayer for bail of the petitioner was earlier rejected after considering the materials that almost all the witnesses have stated that the petitioner took money from many persons to provide them job. The informant and others deposited the money in the account of the petitioner, thereafter, the petitioner filed the complaint case alleging therein that he received money for selling a piece of land.

Considering the facts that almost all the witnesses have supported the case of the informant that the petitioner took money from different persons including the informant for providing them job, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is again rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J.)

KKSINHA/-

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

