

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.41703 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -3 Year- 2016 Thana -GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP. District-
PATNA

=====

1. Sanoj Yadav, S/o Late Kamal Yadav, Resident of Shankarpur, P.S.-
Muffasil, District- Munger.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Union of India through S.K. Pandey, Assistant Director, Directorate of
Enforcement, Govt. of India 1st Floor Chandpura Place, Bank Road, West
Gandhi Maidan, Patna- 800001.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Sinha
For the UOI : Mr. Satyavrat Verma

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

4 24-09-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the informant
and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in Spl Trial No. (PMLA)
03/2016, arising out of Complaint Case No. 03/2016, instituted for
the offence under Section 4 of Money Laundering Act (PMLA).

Allegation against this petitioner is that he has movable
and immovable property in his name as well as in the name of his
wife through proceeds of crime. It is alleged that during
investigation it was found that he has acquired Rs. 5,70,159/- in
his name as well as in the name of his wife during the period 2008
to 2015.



Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the complaint petition allegation has been made of acquiring property of Rs. 8,65,006/- but the investigation report shows that he has acquired property worth Rs. 5,70,159/-.

Learned counsel for the informant has filed counter affidavit stating that petitioner was not appearing before the court below despite issuance of summons. He was arrested by the police in another case at Munger and thereafter remanded in this case. Due to non-appearance of the petitioner before the court below, framing of charge could not be done till date and trial has hampered badly. It is further submitted that statement recorded under Section 50 of PMLA Act is admissible in law.

In view of such, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for bail of petitioner is rejected.

Petitioner is given liberty to renew his prayer for bail after six months in the event no substantive progress is made in trial.

(Sanjay Priya, J.)

Rakhi

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

