

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19897 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-66 Year-2018 Thana- BELCHHI District- Patna

Ashwin Kumar @ Ashwini Kumar @ Mukesh Kumar Singh@ Mukesh Kumar, aged about 34 years (Male), Son of Arjun Ram, Resident of Mahua Bagh, Patna Police Station- Rupaspur, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Radha Mohan Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satyavrat Verma

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

4 28-06-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Belachhi
P.S. Case No. 66 of 2018 registered under Sections 420, 467,
468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

The informant Nitish Kumar lodged Belachhi P.S.
Case No. 66 of 2018 alleging therein that the petitioner, son of
Arjun Ram received Rs. 4,00,000/- on the pretext of providing
job on the post of Computer Operator in P.M.C.H. and believing
the same the informant paid the same out of which Rs.
3,40,000/- in cash and Rs. 60,000/- in the Bank Account which
is in the name of his wife. After some time, accused gave
joining letter of Computer Operator , was found fraudulent and



when he informed to him, he asked to wait and thereafter joining will be make and the accused took back the joining letter and later on he received Rs. 4,00,000/- each from Avinash Kumar and Pramod Kumar for job of Computer Operator in I.G.I.M.S. and took back joining letter which was fraudulent. However, Avinash Kumar had retained the photo copy of joining letter.

Learned counsel has submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is concocted and false.

However, I gone through the case diary. Paragraphs 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21, 22, 23 and 27 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. Hence, it is not a fit case for grant of bail.

In the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected. However, the charge is framed against the petitioner. The trial court is directed to conclude the trial within one year from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Nasimul/-

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

