

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81064 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-150 Year-2019 Thana- JAMUI District- Jamui

Ram Sharan Prasad @ Ram Sharan Mahto, aged about 42 years (Male), Son
of Late Prasadi Mahato Resident of Village - Kakan, P.S.- Jamui, District-
Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bharat Lal

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Navin Kumar Pandey

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 17-09-2020 Heard Mr. Bharat Lal, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey, counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is apprehending his
arrest in connection with Jamui (Adarsh) P.S. Case No. 150 of
2019 registered for offences under sections 467, 468, 471, 419,
420, 120(B), 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The present case was instituted on the complaint
received from Rajesh Sharan making a statement that one
Sudhakar Kumar Das has received a notice from the Civil
Court, Jamui when there is no such case pending against him.
When he has enquired of the same, then he came to know that
one person under his name is working in Middle School, Ikeriya
(Jamui) whose actual name is Roshan Kumar Das, son of



Yogendra Das and he has impersonated and worked as a Teacher in that school by making false statement.

During investigation, said Roshan Kumar Das was examined by the police and stated that he was an unemployed youth and the present petitioner has informed him that one Sudhakar Kumar Das has been selected for appointment from two places including Middle School, Ikeriya (Jamui) which is at present vacant and, if you would incur expenses, then he will make arrangement for his appointment in the said Middle School, Ikeriya, on which the petitioner paid money to him and, thereafter, he obtained the appointment letter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no material against the petitioner save and except Sudhakar Kumar Das is in inimical term as he had committed theft of ATM Card from which he withdrew money, led to institution of a criminal case.

The document on which reliance has been placed is the document of Panchayatinama which do not inspire much confidence to the Court.

Looking to the entire facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected.

If the petitioner surrenders before the court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays for bail, the court below, without being prejudiced by this order, will take a decision in accordance with law.

It is, however, made clear that the police will not arrest the petitioner for a period of three weeks from today but, thereafter, this interim protection will be treated to have been withdrawn.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

rishi/-

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

