

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27212 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-135 Year-2016 Thana- LADANIA District- Madhubani

-
1. ABHIMANUY KUMAR VERMA @ ABHIMANYU KUMAR VERMA
Son of Gangadhar Prasad Verma Resident of Village - Sukhasan (Chakla),
P.S.- Madhepura, Distt - Madhepura.
 2. Rajeev Ranjan @ Rajiv Ranjan Son of Binay Kumar Das Resident of
Mohalla - Chitragupta Nagar near Government Polytechnic, P.S. - Purnea,
Distt - Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Branch Manager, Punjab National Bank, Ladania Branch, P.S-Ladania,
Dist.-Madhubani

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Viveka Nandsingh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Dr. Ajeet Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

6 28-08-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Ladaniya P.S. Case No. 135 of 2016 registered under
sections 406 and 409 of the I.P.C. pending in the Court of
A.C.J.M.-IV, Madhubani.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is
that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in
the present case. They are not named in the first information
report. In the F.I.R. co-accused Sanjay Kumar, Head Cashier of



Punjab National Bank, has been made accused. In course of investigation, it has come that petitioner no.2 Rajeev Ranjan is brother of co-accused and petitioner no. 1 is brother of wife of co-accused. Further submission is that the petitioners have not withdrawn the alleged amount either through A.T.M. Card, withdrawal Slip or any cheque and they have been made accused of Bank conspiracy.

Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioners by contending that on perusal of the supplementary counter affidavit filed on behalf of the Bank, it appears that the petitioners have withdrawn the alleged money on different dates by cheques, which was transferred by the co-accused Sanjay Kumar. Hence, the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Having considered the above facts and circumstances of the case and nature of allegation, I am not inclined to allow the prayer of the petitioners for bail. Accordingly, this application is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

shailendra/-

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

