

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22502 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-285 Year-2018 Thana- DUMRA District- Sitamarhi

=====

PRAVEEN ARA, W/o Md. Ali Ansari Resident of Village Rajopatti, Urdu
Mohalla, Ward No. 14, P.S. Sitamarhi, District Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.N.K. Agrawal, Sr.Adv.
		Mr. Birendra Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr.Ajay Mishra, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 18-07-2019 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

Petitioner, in the present case, is seeking anticipatory
bail in connection with Dumra P.S. Case No.285 of 2018
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409,
420, 467, 468, 471 and 472/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that
so far as this petitioner is concerned, she is only a housewife
and her only fault was that she has joined in the bank account as
a joint signatory with her husband who happens to be a teacher
and is said to be involved in acting in conspiracy with Nazir
who was in-charge of the pre-matriculation scholarship. It is
submitted that being a joint signatory to the bank account only
she has been made accused in the present case.



On the other hand, learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer submitting that it is not a fact that the money had gone only in the joint account. Referring to paragraph 78 of the case diary it has been submitted that from the joint account money had travelled to different individual accounts and one of those accounts in which money had gone belongs to this petitioner. He has also produced a copy of the order dated 24.06.2019 passed in Cr.Misc.No.23063 of 2019 Cr.Misc.No. No.3609 of 2019 to submit that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the co-accused similarly situated have been refused by the learned coordinate Bench of this Court.

Having heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State in view of the materials available in the case diary which have been placed before this Court and the fact that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the co-accused has been rejected, this Court is not willing to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to this petitioner. The prayer is refused.

This application is dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

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

