

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.56108 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -743 Year- 2016 Thana -PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
PATNA

=====

1. Parmanand Kumar, Son of Late Kailash Prasad, Resident of Upgraded Middle School, Mukhdumpur, P.S.- Phulwari Sharif, District- Patna, 800002.

2. Arun Kumar Ravi, Son of Late Rajdeo Das, Resident of Digha, Jamakharaj Bagicha, P.O.+P.S.- Digha, District- Patna.

3. Deonath Prasad, Son of Dwarika Das, Resident of Nirala Nagar, Behind Polshan, P.O.+P.S.- Digha, District- Patna Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

2. Munna Saw, Son of Sri Radhe Saw, Resident of Mohalla- Chailli Tal, Naya Gaw, P.O.- Gulzarbagh, Patna, Pin Code- 800007.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Dudheshwar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Parties : Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP 94

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR

JHA

ORAL ORDER

2 14-12-2017

Heard both sides.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in Complaint Case No. 743 of 2016 for the offences allegedly committed under Sections 406, 420, 120B and other sections of the Indian Penal Code.

The complainant alleged that the petitioners are the Director, Branch Manager and Assistant Director of Weird Infrastructure Corporation Limited and Weird Infureality, Gurhatta, Maha Laxmi Complex, Second Floor, Khajekalan, Patna City, Patna. The accused persons persuaded the complainant and others to deposit money in the company. The complainant deposited Rs.7,00,000/- in fixed deposit and Rs.2,37,600/- in monthly deposit scheme. The amount was matured on 12.01.2014, but, the complainant did not receive any farthing.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



the petitioners are not the Director, Branch Manager and the Assistant Director of the Corporation, but, they are commission agent. The petitioners have got no criminal antecedent and this is the first case in which the petitioners have been implicated. The petitioners have also invested huge amount in the Corporation.

From the perusal of the contents of the complaint petition, it appears that the complainant had made specific allegation that the petitioners persuaded the complainant to deposit in monthly deposit scheme as well as in fixed deposit scheme. The petitioners deposited Rs.7,00,000/- in fixed deposit scheme and Rs.2,37,600/- in monthly deposit scheme, but, even after maturity in the year 2014, the complainant did not get even a single farthing.

Considering the allegation, made against the petitioners, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail is **rejected**.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

SA/-

U	√	T	√
---	---	---	---

