

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.30427 of 2018

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

- =====
1. Ramesh Kumar Yadav, S/o Sheo Nath Yadav, R/o Village- Dhanadi Sakari, P.S. Kudra, District- Kaimur at Bhabhua
 2. Ajay Kumar Singh, S/o Babulal Singh, R/o House No. 204, Village Baliyan, P.S. Nasariganj, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
 3. Sarfuddin Ansari, S/o Md. Sulaman Ansari, R/o Village- Tara, P.S. Daudnagar, District Aurangabad.
 4. Raja Ram Paswan, S/o Bangali Paswan, R/o Village Badiha, P.S. Dehri, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.
 5. Manoj Kumar Singh @ Manoj Kumar, S/o Late Indradeo Singh, R/o Village- Patanwakala, P.S. Indrapuri, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Faguni Sah, S/o Late Kanhiya Sah, resident of Village- Katav, P.S.- Indrapuri, District- Rohtas at Sasaram.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anish Chandra

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 26-06-2018 The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 33 of 2016, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Case as per the complaint petition is that complainant happens to be agent of the Influence Producer Company and Nidhi India Limited and petitioner nos. 4 and 5 arrived at his village and told that they are officers of Influence Producer Company and



Nidhi India Limited and insisted the complainant to join as agent and to bring the customers to invest in the said company and the investors will be given good returns. Thereafter, complainant convinced other persons to invest in the company and some of the persons invested huge amount in the said company but no dividend /interest was paid then the complainant approached to the main office, where he was abused and they are not willing to return the money of the investors.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 happens to be the Members of Board of Directors and they have nothing to do with the said allegation and further there is no specific allegation against them rather the allegation is against petitioner no. 4 and 5. It has also been submitted that other co-accused having similar allegation has already been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 05.04.2018, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 8132 of 2018.

Heard learned A.P.P. also.

Having heard both sides, in view of the above facts, let the petitioner nos. 1 to 3, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, be enlarged on bail



on furnishing bond of Rs. 25,000 (Rs. Twenty Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned SDJM, Dehri, Rohtas at Sasaram, in connection with Complaint Case No. 33 of 2016, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

So far other petitioners i.e. petitioner nos 4 and 5 are concerned, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he may be allowed to withdraw their prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, this application with regard to petitioner nos. 4 and 5 stands dismissed as withdrawn.

This application is accordingly disposed of.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunil/-

U			
---	--	--	--

