

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.41033 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -357 Year- 2012 Thana -SIKARPUR District-
WESTCHAMPARAN(BETTIAH)

=====

1. Rajesh Kumar Soni, Son of Ram Shravan Prasad, Resident of Mohalla-Prakash Nagar, Ward No.13, Narkatiyaganj, Police Station- Shikarpur, District- West Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Anzarul Haque Sahara, APP 225.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

5 28-08-2018

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Shikarpur Police Station Case No. 357 of 2012, instituted for the offences under Sections 342, 323, 379, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

In the written report, it is alleged that the petitioner was Manager of N.G.O., namely, Kalyan Ghar Muskan Grahak Bima Kendra, Narkatiaganj. The informant was working as agent in the aforesaid N.G.O. It is alleged that the informant collected money for insurance and deposited the same with the petitioner. It is further alleged that for the period 08.02.2010 to 08.04.2011, the informant got premium from Insurance Policy holders and got deposited the same to the petitioner. In the meantime, the informant got information that petitioner has not deposited the money of insurance in Divisional Office



and he used to issue forged receipt in the name of the Head Office. When the informant went to head office, he came to know that the premium of the Insurance holders has not been deposited in the head office and forged receipt has been issued by the petitioner. When the matter was enquired from the petitioner by the head office, he accepted his guilt and executed an agreement on stamp paper with regard to amount of Rs. 25940/- and promised to pay the said amount to the informant within a month. The petitioner did not return the amount.

The agreement which has been executed by the petitioner is part of the F.I.R., from which it appears that petitioner has admitted his guilt and he has also undertaken to make payment of the amount, which has been deposited by the informant and other agents as mentioned in the agreement.

Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Priya, J.)

Rakhi/abhijeet-

.U		T	
----	--	---	--

