

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.56638 of 2017**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -918 Year- 2012 Thana -ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-  
SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

Rajendra Dubey, Son of Dwarika Dubey, Resident of Village- Olha, Police  
Station- Harsidhi, District- East Champaran at Motihari.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Devmuni Paswan, Son of Late Medha Paswan, Resident of Village-  
Kiranchola, Police Station- Chenari, District- Rohtas.

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR  
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

-----

2      07-12-2017                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned  
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with  
Complaint Case No.918 of 2012 registered under Section 420 of  
the Indian Penal Code.

The accusation is that in course of visiting of the  
complainant/opposite party no.2 Devmuni Paswan at the Welfare  
Department, Sasaram, he came in the touch of the petitioner, who  
was Clerk in that Department. In that course, the petitioner asked  
the complainant/opposite party no.2 that the vacancies of Security  
Guards are to be filled up for the residential schools, governed



under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Welfare Department, on remuneration of Rs.2000/- and also asked that Rs.26000/- would have to be deposited for the appointment of Security Guards as security money. Accordingly, the complainant/opposite party no.2 and four other persons agreed for the same and gave Rs.1,30,000/- to the petitioner. The petitioner asked them to come after 10 days but, in the meantime, the petitioner was transferred from the Welfare Department, Sasaram, to Vaishali at Hajipur. In spite of repeated request, neither the job was provided to the complainant/opposite party no.2 and four other persons nor the money was returned to them by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case by the complainant/opposite party no.2 only to put undue pressure upon him. While it is alleged in the complaint petition that the complainant/opposite party no.2 and four other persons had given Rs.1,30,000/- (Rs.26000/-each) to the petitioner as security money but the name of four other persons have not been disclosed in the complaint petition.

Having considered the facts and the circumstances of the case, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or



surrender by him within six weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on his furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rohtas at Sasaram, in connection with Complaint Case No.918 of 2012, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

**(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)**

**P.S./-**

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

