

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50707 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-299 Year-2018 Thana- TARAIYA District- Saran

Ajay Kr. Singh, Son of Sri Devendra Singh Resident of Village-Rampur
Keshow, P.S-Taraiya, District-Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Mukesh Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Binod Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 14-08-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Taraiya P.S. Case No.299 of 2018 for the offence punishable
under Sections 323, 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 504/34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioner as per the First
Information Report-cum-Complaint lodged by one Harendra
Singh is that petitioner represented himself as a member of
Silicon Projects India Limited which is a non-banking financial
company and represented the complainant / informant to invest
the amount in this company which would be doubled after a
period of five years. The further allegation is that on the
representation of the petitioner and others, the informant /



complainant invested a sum of Rs. 1 lakh in the name of his father in the year 2013 and after five years when the informant demanded the maturity amount of the invested amount, he found that the company had fled away after closing the office situated at Mahrora and the amount deposited by the father of the informant has not been returned as promised.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner was working as an employee of the said company whereas the Manager of the company was Dheeraj Tiwary and introducer is one Vijay Kumar Tiwary. Learned counsel further submits that money receipt was issued by the company, Silicon Projects India Ltd., as would be evident from Annexure -2 and the petitioner is not the authorized signatory of the same. Learned counsel further submits that company and its Director have not been made accused by the informant and the petitioner was a low paid employee and due to the same he has been made accused in this case.

After having heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner was working as an employee of the company and the complainant has not made



the company and its Director as an accused in this case and money receipt was issued by so called company, as such, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the petitioner, above named, is directed to surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today and in the event of surrender by him, he shall be released on anticipatory bail by the Court below upon furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saran at Chapra, subject to the condition as mentioned under Section 438 (2) of Cr.P.C.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

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

