

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1414 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2017 Thana- SHEOHAR District- Sheohar

Suraj Kumar @ Suraj Kumar Singh, son of Manoj Yadav, Resident of Village-
Dhamdaha, P.S. Purnea, District-Purnea

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Md. Anisur Rahman

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 23-04-2019 Petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in connection with Sheohar P.S. Case No. 171 of 2017, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 468 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegation as per FIR is that the informant received a mobile call said to have been made by the Secretary, PHED Department for sending Rs.10 lacs to him and somebody was in the hospital and thereafter informant talked with the contractor Manoj Kumar Singh and from whom he has taken a cheque for Rs.10 lacs and deposited in the SBI Sheohar Branch. It is also alleged that one Sanjeev Ranjan asked him to deposit the same in the account No. 1681101011429 and later on the informant received a message that such type of call is being made by mobile and it is a forged call and on that payment should not be made. However, the informant had gone to his house and as the matter was serious, he could not made



any complaint immediately but once he returned he went to SBI Sheohar Branch and tried to prevent the payment from that account but in the meantime withdrawal was made. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. However, it appears that during investigation name of the petitioner transpired.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that name of the petitioner transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused and except that there is nothing against him and he has no criminal antecedent.

Heard learned APP, who has drawn my attention towards several paragraphs of the case diary which show that not only name of the petitioner has been disclosed by other accused, rather CDR details also shows that petitioner was in constant touch with the accused persons.

Having heard both sides and considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Hence, this application is dismissed.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

spal/-

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

