

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Revision No.23 of 2016

=====

Mukesh Kumar @ Kamlesh Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar Bhardwaj Son of
Ishwari Singh, Resident of C/14, Krishna Apartment, Boring Road, P.S.-
S.K. Puri, District- Patna

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The Union of India through the Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of
Investigation, Patna

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Bipin Kumar Sinha, (SC/CBI)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI
SHARAN SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 28-04-2017 The petitioner is an accused of Special Case No. 4 of
2009/ RC 01 of 2009, registered for the offence under Sections 7,
8, 10, 12, 13(2) read with section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of
Corruption Act, 1988. He is aggrieved by an order dated
23.09.2013 passed by the learned Special Judge CBI, Patna
whereby he has rejected the petition filed by the petitioner for
release of Saving A/c Account No. 0055-F-60856-.005 of Indus
Ind. Bank Ltd., Patna Branch and Saving A/C Account No.
ANWB-030701000928 of ICICI Bank Ltd. Kankarbagh, Patna.

As per the case of the prosecution, in the name of
securing employment for young persons in CRPF through
backdoor, the petitioner duped them and received huge amount of
money from them. The amount, which is said to be lying in the



said two accounts, is the ill-gotten money of the petitioner in that manner. The petitioner is a constable in CRPF.

Learned counsel for petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in need of money for treatment of his child and the court failed to consider the said aspect of the matter. He has also submitted that the amount deposited in the said two accounts is his own earned money.

I am not inclined to entertain this application for two reasons. Firstly, no gross illegality has been pointed out on behalf of the petitioner in the impugned order touching the court's jurisdiction or impropriety. Secondly, the present criminal revision has been filed more than two years after passing of the impugned order. I do not find any cogent explanation on record for so much in delay in filing the present criminal revision application with the same plea as the petitioner has taken before the court below that the money was required for the treatment of his son. The application, in my view is not bonafide. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)

BTiwary/-

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

