

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.19547 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -5 Year- 2017 Thana -VIGILANCE District- PATNA

- =====
1. Dhaneshwar Kumar Singh, presently Block Supply Officer, Phatehpur, Block- Gaya, aged about 60 years, son of late Pancham Singh, resident of Mohalla- Shri Om Saw Durga Bari Road, in front of Madarasa, P.S. Civil Line, District- Gaya, presently resident of Anisabad, Behind Post Office, P.O.- Anisabad, P.S.- Gardanibagh, District- Patna, Parental Address, Village- Naya Gaon, P.S.- Naya Gaon, District- Saran (Chapra).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Inspector of Police, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Suresh Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

4/ 06-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and the learned Sr. counsel for the Vigilance Department.

The Petitioner apprehends his arrest in Vigilance Case No.05 of 2017 bearing Spl. Case No.03 of 2017 instituted for the offence under Section(s) 13(2) read with Section 13(1) (e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, pending in the Court of the Special Juge, Vigilance-1, Patna.

As per written report, the petitioner being posted as Block Supply Officer, Fatehpur, by adopting illegal and corrupt means and abusing his official position amassed disproportionate



assets worth ₹69,54,496/- in his name and in the name of his other family members. He failed to give satisfactory explanation for this income before the Vigilance Officials during enquiry.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has explained income and expenses, in detail, in para 14 of the bail petition.

In reply to the aforesaid submission, learned Sr. counsel for Vigilance has submitted that in para 10 of Counter Affidavit, it has been clearly stated that during course of preliminary enquiry, it transpired that in between the check period, the petitioner received ₹87,64,312/- by way of salary, house rent, income from agriculture and loan, whereas, total investment made by him during check period was found to be ₹1,57,18,808/-, thus, total ₹69,54,496/- has been found as his disproportionate assets.

From the written report, it appears that the matter is still at the stage of enquiry by the Vigilance Department.

In view of such, this Court does not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail.

Prayer is, accordingly, rejected.

The petitioner may surrender before the Court below and seek regular bail, which shall be considered and disposed of



on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

JA/-

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

