

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.1080 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -1503 Year- 2014 Thana -MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- MUZAFFARPUR

=====

Arvind Thakur @ Arvind Kumar Thakur, S/o Sukdeo Thakur, Resident of
Village - Kishanpura, P.S. - Piar, Dist - Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Vijay Kumar, S/o Jainarayan Bhagat, resident of village - Mustafaganj,
P.S. - Minapur, Dist - Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Mukeshwar Dayal

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA MOHAN
SHARMA**
ORAL ORDER

3 29-03-2017 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned A.P.P. for the State as also the learned counsel for the

Complainant.

In this application for anticipatory bail the petitioner
apprehends his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 1503
of 2014/ Trial No. 1208 of 2016 for the offences punishable under
sections 420 and 120 B of the I.P.C.

Allegedly, the petitioner duped the complainant and
took Rs. 6,000/- from the complainant to get the tempo of the
complainant insured and after one hour the petitioner gave policy
paper to the complainant and then the complainant came to his
house but on 13.06.2014 when the complainant went for getting
the tempo insured for the year 2014-15 and gave his paper then the



clerk in the office of the Insurance Company told the complainant that the insurance paper is forged document and the amount of Rs.4,200/- has been cheated. The petitioner and others being in collusion and conspiracy have cheated the complainant and now they are not returning the amount of Rs.4,200/- to the complainant.

Submission is of false implication and that the petitioner is neither employee nor agent of the Insurance Company, he has not taken the amount and all the allegations are false and concocted, the petitioner has been implicated falsely and as such he deserves sympathetic consideration.

The learned A.P.P. duly assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant opposes prayer for pre-arrest bail of the petitioner by submitting that it was the petitioner who took money and gave forged insurance paper to the complainant.

In the facts and circumstances as stated above, considering the allegation, I am not inclined to grant privilege of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner and accordingly his such prayer stands rejected in connection with the aforementioned case pending in the court of C.J.M. Muzaffarpur.

(Jitendra Mohan Sharma, J)

Abhay/-

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

