

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Miscellaneous No.62838 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -22 Year- 2015 Thana -C.B.I CASE District- PATNA

=====

1. Sanjay Kumar Sinha, Son of Late Jagdish Prasad Sinha, Resident of
village- Babhnour P.S.- Narhat, District- Nawada. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through C. B. I. , Patna. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar (SC,CBI)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR

JHA

ORAL ORDER

2 18-04-2018

Heard both sides.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in R.C. case No. 22(A)/2015, corresponding to Special Case No. 2 of 2016, for the offences punishable under Section 120B read with Section 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 13(2) read with 13(1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

The prayer of petitioner for anticipatory bail was earlier rejected by this court vide order dated 11.05.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 16199 of 2017.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner applied for GDS Packer. The appointment was contractual one and similarly situated other persons, namely, Daizy, Ranjit Kumar, Satyanarayan Singh, Sobha Sinha and others have already been granted bail vide orders passed in Cr. Misc. No.



49549 of 2017, Cr. Misc. No. 47268 of 2017, Cr. Misc. No. 49588 of 2017 and in Cr. Misc. No. 38547 of 2017 respectively and the case of petitioner stands on the same footing but I find that it was the petitioner who applied for appointment on the post of GDS Packer. The petitioner submitted forged and fabricated marks sheet of Madhyama said to have been issued by Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, Patna. It transpired that the marks sheet bearing Code No. 4301, Roll No. 721 of the year 2006 was issued in the name of Soni Kumari who got only 327 marks but the petitioner forged the marks sheet and it was shown in the marks sheet that petitioner got 92% marks in the Madhyama examination and it was the petitioner who made attempt to get appointment in the post office on the forged certificate and considering these facts the prayer of petitioner for anticipatory bail was earlier rejected.

I do not find any new ground to reconsider the prayer of petitioner for anticipatory bail and the same is once again rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

BKS/-

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

