

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.54088 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2018 Thana- GOPALPUR District- Gopalganj

-
1. Parshuram Yadav @ Prashuram Yadav, Son of Bhagirathi Yadav,
 2. Rajeshwar Yadav, Son of Bhagirathi Yadav, Resident of Village- Mahanthawan, Police Station- Kateya, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Sri Prakash Mahto, Advocate
Sri Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary

For the Opposite Party/s : A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 11-09-2018 Heard Sri Prakash Mahto, learned counsel, assisted by

Sri Rajesh Kumar Chaudhary, learned counsel for the petitioners

and learned Additional Public Prosecutor.

Two petitioners, apprehending their arrest in connection with Gopalpur P.S. Case No. 89 of 2018, registered for the offence under Sections 420/467/468/471/323/504/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, have prayed for grant of bail in the event of their arrest or surrender.

Learned counsel for the petitioners by way of referring to the F.I.R. submits that in the F.I.R. no specific date has been stated as to on which date the complainants had given money to the petitioners. He further submits that even accusation was only made against petitioner no. 1. Against



petitioner no. 2 there is no accusation save and except that
petitioner no. 2 was also running office with petitioner no. 1.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has opposed
prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

Besides hearing, I have perused the materials
available on record. In the F.I.R. there is specific accusation
that petitioners have cheated innocent persons in the garb of
providing employment to them abroad and number of persons
have been cheated. Besides this, on perusal of statement made
in paragraph - 3 of the petition it appears that besides the
present case petitioners are accused in other cases also.
Meaning thereby that petitioners are habitual offender of such
type of offence, and accordingly in such cases there is no
reason to entertain the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

The petition stands dismissed.

(Rakesh Kumar, J)

praful/-

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

