

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.8132 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -33 Year- 2016 Thana -ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
SASARAM (ROHTAS)

=====

1. Dinesh Kumar, S/o Ram Rekha Singh, r/o Village- Majhigawa, P.S.-
Rohtas, District- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar,
2. Faguni Sah, S/o Late Kanhaiya Sah, R/o Village- Katar, P.S.- Indrapuri,
District- Rohtas.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Yogendra Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3/ 05-04-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

APP for the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in **Complaint Case**
No.33 of 2016 instituted for the offence under Section(s) 406/34
Indian Penal Code.

The Complainant claimed himself to be agent of
Influence Producer Company and Nidhi India Ltd. It is alleged in
the Complaint Petition that co-accused, Raja Ram Paswan and
Manoj Kumar Singh, arrived in the village and told the
Complainant that they are the Officers of aforesaid Company and
said the Complainant to join the company as agent and work for
the company. The investors will get good return. Thereafter, the
Complainant joined the Company as agent and got invested



money of different persons as mentioned in the Complaint Petition in MIS scheme. Receipts and Bonds were given to those persons. Aforesaid investors used to get the interest from the Bank Account. Thereafter, for the 12 months, the Company did not pay money to the aforesaid persons and witnesses. The Complainant went to enquire then the Complainant was assured that they will get money from next month. The investors did not get money. They put pressure on the Complainant and, ultimately, when he went to the office of the Company on 20.01.2016, the accused persons fled away after closing the institution.

In the Complaint Petition also, entire allegation has been levelled against accused nos.5 and 6, namely, Raja Ram Paswan and Manoj Kumar Singh. This petitioner has been described as petitioner no.4 as a member of Board of Directors of the Company, but there is no allegation of any specific overt act against this petitioner in the Complaint Petition.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail is allowed. In the event of surrender/arrest of the petitioner, named above, within six weeks from today in connection with **Complaint Case No.33 of 2016**, he shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail



bond of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the **Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dehri-on-Sone, Rohtas**, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) Cr. P. C. with further conditions:
(1) bailors should be local having sufficient immovable property within the jurisdiction of the court concerned, (2) petitioner shall cooperate in the trial and shall be present on each and every date fixed by the court and his absence on two consecutive dates without proper and reasonable reason will be liable to cancel his bail bond and (3) if petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses of the case, in that case, prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

JA/-

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

