

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60770 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-509 Year-2010 Thana- GANDHIMAIDAN District- Patna

SRI SIDHESHWARI PRASAD @ SIDHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA Son of  
Late Dwarika Prasad Sinha Resident of Village - Chitragupt Nagar West of  
Sanjivani Hospital, Sadikpur Kankarbagh, P.S.- Patrakar Nagar, Patna.-  
800020.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dilip Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Rakesh

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      25-09-2019              The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with  
  
Gandhi Maidan P. S. Case No. 509 of 2010 registered under  
  
Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation against the petitioner is that petitioner along  
with other accused persons allured the informant stating that  
they would be providing training for call centre in the Company  
named Ariable Web Technology and after giving training the  
informant would be provided job in Vodaphone, Aircel and Idea  
Company and other departments. It has further been alleged that  
the informant was told to deposit a sum of Rs. 7500/- in three  
installments in a month for the purpose of training and after  
getting job, he would be given Rs. 3-4 thousand per month as  
remuneration. On the representation of the petitioner and others,



the informant joined the company and paid a sum of Rs. 5500/- on 25.08.2010. The petitioner and other accused persons thereafter demanded balance amount from the informant upon which he told that they may deduct it from his monthly salary. When the informant made enquiry from Gandhi Maidan Police Station, he came to know that company was fake.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence in the manner alleged. He further submits that petitioner has not received any amount from the informant and there is no direct allegation of allurement upon the petitioner.

Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the fact that petitioner is named in the FIR which was lodged in the year 2010 and the petitioner has moved this application after lapse of about nine years, as such I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

**(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)**

sujit/-

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

