

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.27817 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-16 Year-2016 Thana- ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR
District- Patna

=====

Ram Chandra Gupta, S/o late Natthu Prasad Gupta, Residents of R/o flat No. 402, Shail Regency Arya Samaj Mandir Road, Saguna, P.S. Danapur, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Economic Offence Unit through Deputy Superintendent, Economic Offence Unit, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Binod Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Matloob Rab

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
C.A.V. ORDER

4 29-08-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Economic Office Unit P.S. Case No. 16 of 2016 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120(B) of the I.P.C. pending in the Court of S.D.J.M., Sadar, Patna.

Earlier prayer of the petitioner for bail was rejected by this Court vide order dated 08.11.2017 (Annexure-1) passed in Cr. Misc. No. 42438 of 2017.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case on mere suspicion. The present case has been registered on



the apprehension of the stamp paper of the agreement to sale to be forged and for that, F.I.R. should have been registered against the person, who has purchased or sold the said stamp paper. Petitioner is only the witness of the transaction.

Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner by contending that the petitioner's prayer for bail was earlier considered and rejected on merit and petitioner has filed the present bail application without there being any fresh ground.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and the fact that there is no fresh ground for re-consideration of the prayer for bail of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to this petitioner. His prayer for bail is, accordingly, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

Shailendra/-

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

