

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32179 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-497 Year-2018 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

RAJESH YADAV Son of Sri Gurusahay Yadav Resident of Village -
Sansarpur, P.S.- Gidhaur, District - Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Puja Kumari Wife of Mukesh Kumar Resident of Mohalla - Bandhwan
Talab, South of Indian Oil, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui
3. Mukesh Kumar Son of Sri Chandrika Sao Resident of Mohalla - Bandhwan
Talab, South of Indian Oil, P.S.- Jamui, District- Jamui

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prakash Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kumar Ranjit Ranjan

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

4 26-02-2020 This application has been filed for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to opposite party nos. 2 and 3 by learned District & Sessions Judge -I, Jamui, vide order dated 27.11.2018 passed in A.B.P. No. 1201/2018 in connection with Jamui P.S. Case No. 497/2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that learned Sessions Judge has not considered the materials available on record against opposite party nos. 2 and 3 as they are concerned with Zelanium Technologies L.L.P. and were



awarded six skill development centres under Chief Minister Skill Development scheme in the district of Jamui and they have taken huge amount to open a new service relating to providing computer training to matric and intermediate level students but the same was not done and the matter was enquired by the District Magistrate, on whose instance the case was lodged.

Heard learned A.P.P. and perused the impugned order, from which, it appears that the learned Sessions Judge has passed the detailed order considering the materials available on record and on consideration that there is no proof of payment of expenditure made by the petitioner as well as no document available in the case diary to show the misappropriation of the amount by opposite party nos. 2 and 3. Further, there is no case of misuse of privilege of bail, tampering with the evidence or their being absconder in this case.

Considering the discussions made above, I find no merit in this application, same is, accordingly, dismissed

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunilkumar/-

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

