

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.37339 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -137 Year- 2016 Thana -VIGILANCE District- PATNA

=====

Gulam Mustafa Ansari @ Ghulam Mustafa Ansari, Son of Late Md. Aziz,
Resident of Flat No.402, Makka Tower, Samanpura, P.S.- Shastri Nagar,
District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar, Patna

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vinay Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, A. C. to
Mr. Ramakant Sharma (L.O.,Inc., Vigilance)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 10-08-2017 Heard learned counsels for the petitioner and the

State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Vigilance P. S. Case No. 137 of 2016 instituted under
Sections 13(2) read with 13(1)(E) of the Prevention of Corruption
Act.

The allegation, in brief, is that petitioner, while being
posted as S.D.M., Jainagar, Madhubani, in a trap case, Rs. One lac
was recovered from him and later on, during raid, Rs. 6,65,000/-
too was recovered from his house and after enquiry, during his
service period from the date of his appointment till the date of
lodging of the case, he is found in having disproportionate asset
worth Rs. 87,42,467/-.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact no money was recovered from his possession. It is stated that while the Peon was going to deliver the said amount, the same was recovered from him and not from the petitioner and the petitioner's father-in-law is a rich person and he has gifted him some plots. He submits that calculation of Item No. 5 is also repeated in Column No. 8.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Vigilance submits that disproportionate assets worth Rs. 87 lacs and above was found in the name of the petitioner and he was trapped taking bribe of Rs. one lac and Rs. six lacs and above was recovered from his house and the case is still at the investigation stage.

Having considered the nature of offence and petitioner is alleged to have been trapped taking Rs. one lac as bribe, so prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Arun Kumar, J)

Sujit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

