

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26624 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2011 Thana- TRIVENIGANJ District- Supaul

Nandlal Ghosh @ Ranjan Kumar Raju @ Ranjan Kumar Singh Son of Shiv
Jatan Singh Resident of Village - Kharasin Karpi, P.S.- Karpi, Distt.- Arwal,
Retired Teacher, High School, Itimaha, Dist.- Arwal-804419

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Akhilesh Kumar S/o Bhuneshwari Yadav, R/o Vill-Kasha, P.S. Triveniganj,
P.S. Supaul.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Kishore Thakur
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRAKASH CHANDRA
JAISWAL**

ORAL ORDER

3 25-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Triveniganj P.S. Case No. 155 of 2011 registered for the offence
punishable under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471 and 120(B)
of the Indian Penal Code.

Petitioner claiming himself to be Board of Director
of National Royal Care persuaded the informant and others to
deposit money in the Bank for lucrative return. Relying upon
the informant and other persons deposited Rs. 20 lacs through
his agent and the agent deposited Rs. 17,12,000/- in the account
of the aforesaid Bank. The petitioner collecting total Rs. 54 lacs



fled away.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He does not happen to be Director of the aforesaid Bank. He has not taken any money. Barring the informant, none of the depositor has made any complain against him. Moreover, the parties have entered into compromise in the case. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent, hence, he may be enlarged on bail.

Per contra, learned counsel for the informant and APP for the State opposing the bail prayer of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has defalcated huge amount of the informant and other depositors and moreover Process under Sections 82 and 83 Cr.P.C. have been issued against the petitioner, hence, he does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

However, petitioner is directed to surrender before the court below within six weeks and seeks regular bail and learned court below shall pass order on the very date of surrender by the petitioner in accordance with law considering the facts and circumstances of the case without being prejudiced



by this order.

(Prakash Chandra Jaiswal, J)

rohit/-

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

