

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20358 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-30 Year-2014 Thana- ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR
District- Patna

-
1. CHANCHALA SINGH Wife of Raman Singh Resident of Village -
Madhubani, P.S.- Sahebganj, District - Muzaffarpur
 2. Raman Singh Son of Late Treta Nath Singh Resident of Village -
Madhubani, P.S.- Sahebganj, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR THROUGH ECONOMIC OFFENCE UNIT Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.V.N.P. Sinha(E.O.U)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-05-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in
connection with Economic Offences P.S. Case No. 30 of 2014
for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 406/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners
submits that the petitioners, who are of clean antecedent,
are innocent and have not committed any offence. In fact, the
petitioner no.1 is a house wife and she has no concern with
the affairs of M/s. Shakati Teletech and Infrastructure Pvt.
Ltd. and the petitioner No.2 is 60% handicapped person and



both of them are silent official of the firm. The main accused is Vikrant Pankaj, who happens to be Joint Director of firm has transferred all the public money in his account. Hence, the petitioners may be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the Economic Offences Unit has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of these petitioners and submitted that these petitioners in connivance of co-accused Vikrant Pankaj have misappropriated the public money. Moreover, these petitioners have also been made accused in another case for misappropriation of huge money in which they were granted bail by the High Court but they are not appearing in the court below since 18.02.2015 which is evident from paragraph 116 of the case diary.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to these petitioners. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of these petitioners are rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

brajesh/-

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

