

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57368 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-137 Year-2018 Thana- SHRIKRISHNAPURI District- Patna
=====

Lalan Kumar S/o Late Kamleshwari Pd. Yadav, R/o House No. 239 Hira Lal
Lane Lodipur Chhajubag, P.S.- Gandhi Maidan, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	: Mr. Y.V. Giri, Senior Advocate
	: Mr.Nagendra Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	: Mr.Sri Nirmal Kumar Sinha, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 14-05-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection

wi th S.K. Puri P.S. Case No. 137 of 2018 for the offence

punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of the Indian

Penal Code.

Learned Senior counsel appearing for the

petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has

not committed any offence. In fact, the entire case is out and

out a false and fabricated case and is based on a cheque

bearing No. 200170 which has been misplaced in the year

2013 itself for which a Sanha bearing No. 1989 dated

18.02.2013 has already been filed by the petitioner in

Kotwali Police Station, which is evident from Annexure-3.

This case is counter blast of Gandhi Maidan P.S. Case No. 150

of 2018 which has been lodged by the petitioner against the



informant and others. The petitioner has never issued any cheque to the informant for transaction of money. Hence, the petitioner may be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of this petitioner and submitted that the petitioner has purchased ornaments of Rs. 79,51,755/- from the informant and gave a cheque bearing No. 200170 dated 07.03.2018 which has been dishonored. Even on repeated requests, the petitioner has not paid the aforesaid amount to the informant. Moreover, the petitioner in order to grab the aforesaid amount has also lodged a false case against the informant. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of this petitioner is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

Brajesh/-

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

