

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20137 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-5 Year-2013 Thana- LALGANJ District- Vaishali

Rajeev Ranjan, Son of Radha Krishna Das Resident of Village - Kushi Nagar,
P.S.- Kanti, Distt - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Senior Manager, Punjab National Bank, Branch -Hajipur, Vaishali Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar- Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary- A.P.P.
For the Bank	:	Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan- Advocate

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HEMANT KUMAR
SRIVASTAVA**

ORAL ORDER

2 18-08-2020 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State and also heard learned counsel appearing for the Bank through video conferencing.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Lalganj P. S. Case No.05 of 2013 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of the I.P.C.

Earlier, petitioner filed Cr. Misc. No.20360 of 2013 seeking anticipatory bail, but subsequently, he withdrew the aforesaid Cr. Misc. No.20360 of 2013 and, accordingly, the said petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated



09.04.2015.

The accusation against the petitioner is that he as well as several other persons were running a bank and the petitioner was working as Branch Manager of the aforesaid bank.

Submission on behalf of the petitioner is that all the co-accused have already been granted privilege of bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court and the name of petitioner came in confessional statement of co-accused, but that co-accused too has been granted bail by this Court.

The first information report goes to show that the case was lodged in the Year 2013 and after two years of lodging the case, petitioner approached this Court for grant of anticipatory bail, but he withdrew the aforesaid petition and after five years of withdrawal of the aforesaid petition, he again approached the Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as submissions of the parties and also taking note of this fact that charge-sheet against the petitioner has already been submitted, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to petitioner and, accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

However, this order shall not cause any prejudice to



concerned Court at the time of consideration of regular bail
application of the petitioner.

(Hemant Kumar Srivastava, J)

vikash/-

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

