

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.57815 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-90 Year-2015 Thana- MITHANPURA District- Muzaffarpur

Niranjan Kumar Verma S/o Late Gorachand Das, resident of Mohalla-Sarashwati Vihar Colony, Near Lerosy Mission Chowk, Kanhauli, P.S.-Musahari, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State Of Bihar
2. Sri Gauri Shankar Singh, S/o Late Ram Sagar Singh resident of Mohalla-Shivpuri, Kajhauria Road, Lane No. 02, P.O.- G.P.O., District- Muzaffarpur-842001.

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                                                                       |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr. Pradhan Murli Manohar Prasad<br>Mr. Raju Kumar Goswami, Advocates |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwary 1                                              |
| For the Informant          | : | Mr.Anil Kumar, Adv                                                    |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN**  
**ORAL ORDER**

4      11-02-2019                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 406, 420 IPC read with Section 138 of the N.I. Act registered in connection with Mithanpura P.S. Case No. 90 of 2015.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and in any event, out of the total amount of Rs. 2,05,000/- received by the complainant, an amount of Rs. 90,000/- has already been paid to one Sitesh Kumar, who happens to be a witness to the present complaint. The petitioner claims clean antecedents.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant appears and opposes the anticipatory bail petition submitting that he has not received any repayment from the petitioner nor the said amount of Rs. 90,000/- from Sitesh Kumar to whom the said amount is



claimed to have been paid. It is submitted that the amount of Rs. 2,05,000/- advanced by the complaint is not in dispute and so also the dishonour of the two cheques issued to the complainant aggregating to Rs. 2,05,000/-.

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

**(Vikash Jain, J)**

Chandran/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

