

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.46290 of 2017**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-13 Year-2017 Thana- ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR  
District- Patna

=====

Sanjay Singh @ Sanjay Kumar Singh Son of Late Sukhdeo Singh, R/o Flat  
No. 301, Agrani Apartment , P.S.- Ramkrishna Nagar, Patna, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Department of Economic Offence, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate  
with Mr. H.L. Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Akhileshwar Pd. Singh, Sr. Advocate  
with Mr. Vijay Anand

For the State Mr. N.Tantiv, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHAKRADHARI SHARAN SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

11    05-09-2018                      Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in connection with Economic Offence P.S. Case No. 13 of 2017. When this matter was taken up on 17.10.2017, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court had directed that no coercive steps shall be taken against him, which interim order has continued. Subsequently, when the matter was taken up on 04.01.2018, the Court had directed personal attendance of the petitioner who is main accused in the said Economic Offence P.S. Case No. 13 of 2017, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.



In compliance of this Court's order dated 04.01.2018, the petitioner had appeared before this Court. It transpires from several orders passed in this case that petitioner has made himself available before the Investigating Officer as and when required for the purpose of investigation.

The allegation against the petitioner is that he along with others he has cheated hundreds of candidates in the name of interview for managing employment for them against various posts.

Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that in the background of the fact that the petitioner has cooperated with the Investigating agency in course of investigation and had presented himself before this Court as and when required, there is no chance of his absconding from the process of law and, therefore, he should be allowed the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Mr. Akhileshwar Prasad Singh, learned Senior Counsel representing the Economic Offence Unit has drawn my attention to an order of this Court dated 17.10.2017, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 47073 of 2017, whereby regular bail of one co-accused Mukesh Kumar has been rejected with the stipulation



that upon framing of charge, he shall be released on bail by the trial Court. He, accordingly, submits that since other co-accused, similarly situated has been refused the privilege of regular bail, privilege of anticipatory bail should not be given to the petitioner. I find force in the submission made by Mr. Akshileshwar Pd. Singh, learned Senior Counsel.

Since a co-ordinate Bench has refused to enlarge the co-accused on regular bail, the privilege of anticipatory bail cannot be allowed to the petitioner.

This anticipatory bail is, accordingly, rejected.

The petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court below within two weeks from today and seek regular bail, if so advised. His claim for regular bail shall be considered in similar manner as indicated by this Court in the order dated 17.10.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 47073 of 2017.

It has been stated on behalf of the Economic Offence Unit, Patna that charge-sheet has already been submitted against the petitioner.

**(Chakradhari Sharan Singh, J)**

arun/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

