

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.35961 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1132 Year-2016 Thana- GAYA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Gaya

=====

Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjiv Kumar, Son of Nand Kishore Prasad, resident of
Village- Kharauna, P.S. Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Mukesh Kumar S/o Sri Om Prakash Gupta, resident of Village- Kujap, P.S.
Chandauti, District- Gaya.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashutosh Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRIYA
ORAL ORDER

3 24-08-2018 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner apprehends arrest in Complaint Case
No. 1132 of 2016 instituted for the offence under Section 420 of
the Indian Penal Code.

The notice issued to the opposite party no. 2 was
validly served but opposite party no.2 did not appear.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner and the complainant started joint business in which
petitioner himself invested an amount of Rs. 15,00,000/-. The
complainant was maintaining the accounts of the said company.
The company went in loss then the complainant refused to
furnish the details of the account with intention to grab the



money. Thereafter, present case has been lodged.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the company's register and the master data it would appear that complainant, this petitioner and one Ranjit Kumar had started the registered company, wherein, the complainant was appointed as an accountant, Ranjit Kumar was appointed as cashier and petitioner was appointed for field work to organize the meeting of the said company in support of which photocopies of the document has been annexed as Annexure 2 and 2/A to this petition.

It has been further submitted that the complainant himself was the Director of the company. He was maintaining the entire accounts of the company and not furnished the detail of the accounts of the company.

In such circumstances, provisional bail of the petitioner vide order dated 02.07.2018 is hereby confirmed. The petitioner will be allowed to remain on same bail bond furnished by him earlier.

(Sanjay Priya, J)

khushbu/-

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

