

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.9288 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -841 Year- 2015 Thana -SAHARSA District- SAHARSA

=====

1. Prem Singh son of Harinandan Prasad Singh resident of Village -
Chitrauli, P.S. - Goraul, District - Vaishali.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nilesh Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 04-04-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Saharsa Sadar P.S. Case No. 841 of 2015 instituted for the offence
under Sections-420, 467, 468, 471/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The prosecution case in short is that as per
advertisement No. 01/14 of Special Work Officer, Central
Selection Commission (Constable Appointment) one Binod
Kumar having application No. 32118546 and roll No. 2661170582
was selected and temporarily appointed on the post of constable.
During inquiry, the signature and left thumb impression of Binod
Kumar was found different from the signature, made during the
written examination. It was also found on asking question from
him that he has knowledge below average with regard to questions



which have been asked in the examination. It is alleged that some another person had appeared in the examination in place of Binod Kumar who got appointment through impersonation.

The C.D. has been received.

Learned APP has submitted that Binod Kumar in his statement before the police at paragraph-8 stated that he had a talk with this petitioner. It is further alleged that the petitioner had charged Rs. 2,20,000/- for getting somebody sat in the examination and for getting him passed in the examination by impersonating somebody else and he paid Rs. 2,20,000/- to this petitioner. Similar statement has been made by the independent witnesses in paragraphs-64 & 65 of the case diary.

In the aforesaid circumstance, this court does not think it proper to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

However, if the petitioner surrenders in the court below and seeks regular bail, the same may be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

A.K.V./-

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

