

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55052 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1140 Year-2017 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE
District- Rohtas

=====

Satya Prakash, Son of Deo Nandan Prasad Resident of B/46, Kusum Vihar,
Kala Kusuma, P.S.-Saraidhela, District-Dhanbad, Jharkhand.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajendra Prasad Singh, Son of Late Kali Charan Singh Resident of Village-
Chandanpura, P.S.-Tilauthu, District-Rohtas.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Satyavrat Verma
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Mohammad Sufyan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-09-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Complaint Case No.1140 of 2017 for the offence punishable
under Sections 323, 406, 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The allegation against the petitioner as per the
complaint is that accused persons including the petitioner used
to run Sankalp Tutorial,t Krishna Nagar Road, Jamtada and son
of the complainant met the accused persons, who promised him
to get him admitted at Swami Vivekanand University, Sagar,
Madhya Pradesh. and gave a total amount of Rs.2,52,000/- to
the accused persons by way of bank deposit and cash etc. It has



further been alleged that subsequently the accused persons provided forged registration number and Marksheets of Auto Mobile Engineering college, when the complainant along with his son went to the University for further studies, it was informed by the University administration that registration as well as Marksheet are forged.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case inasmuch as from perusal of the complaint, it would be evident that there is specific allegation against one Ranjeet and Ritesh to whom the money was given by the complaint and his son in the bank account and by cash. Learned counsel further submits that there is no specific allegation of payment of amount to the petitioner and the allegation against him is vague, general and omnibus. Learned counsel further submits that the money allegedly was given by the complainant to the co-accused in the year 2013 and no specific date has been disclosed by the complainant as to when the complainant came to know about the forged certificate / registration slip provided to the son of the complainant by the accused persons.

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 there is no specific allegation of payment of any amount to the petitioner and further the allegation of payment of amount is against other accused persons, 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 Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtas, subject to the condition as mentioned under Section 438 (2) of Cr.P.C.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

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

