

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39692 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-876 Year-2018 Thana- DANAPUR District-
Patna

=====

RAVI KISHORE, aged about 42 years, male, Son of Sri Ram Lal Resident of
Village - Flat No.101, Shanti Archid Apartment, Shekhpura, P.S.-
Shastrinagar, Dist.- Patna. Presently Residing at Flat No.207, rounak
Capital Green Apartment, Mathiyapur, P.S.- Danapur, Dist.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arbind Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party: Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Ansar Ul Haque, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

3 23-08-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences
alleged under Sections 420, 406, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian
Penal Code and Section 138 of Negotiable Instrument Act
registered in connection with Danapur P.S. Case No. 876 of 2018.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely
implicated on the accusation that he and his wife had taken
Rs. 11,00,000/- from the informant for business purpose but he
did not execute any agreement when requested to do so. A
cheque for Rs. 9,00,000/- towards part payment issued by the
petitioner bounced. It is submitted that the petitioner has
received only Rs. 2,00,000/- in his bank account and the claim of
the remaining Rs. 9,00,000/- based on the bounced cheque is
denied as the cheque in question is forged. The petitioner is
accused in one prior case of similar nature in Danapur P.S. Case



No. 283 of 2019.

4. Learned APP assisted by learned counsel for the informant appears and has been heard. Learned counsel for the informant submits that a cheque of Rs. 9,00,000/- issued by the petitioner but on presentation to the bank the same was dishonoured pursuant to which a legal notice was also issued to the petitioner to which no reply has been received. It is further submitted that even earlier the petitioner had committed similar offence in connection with taking money for sale of his flat and respect of which Danapur P.S. Case No. 283 of 2019 had been instituted against him. It is further stated that anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner's wife Janvi @ Jyotsana Kumari has been rejected by this Court by order dated 21.06.2019 in Cr. Misc. No. 37718 of 2019.

5. Having regard to the nature of accusation, gravity of the offence alleged, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The anticipatory bail petition stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Ibrar//-

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

