

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34566 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-113 Year-2019 Thana- JAHANABAD District- Jehanabad

=====

PRADEEP KUMAR SINGH @ PRADEEP SINGH @ CHITIRANJAN
SINGH S/o Jitendra Nath Singh Resident of Ward No. 38, Tar Bangla, Dehri-
on-sona, P.S.- Dehri-on-sona, District- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rvi Shankar S/o Surendra Rai, House No.67, Radhika Nagar, Jamshedpur
(Jharkhand)

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.Rabindra Kumar Priyadarshi, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr.Pancha Nand Pandit, APP
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mrs. Prakritita Sharma, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

9 09-04-2021 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for

the State and learned counsel for the opposite party No.2 through

virtual mode.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection
with Jehanabad P.S. case No.113 of 2019 registered under Sections
406, 420, 467, 471/34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court
of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad.

Allegation is that the petitioner took loan of
Rs.15,78,000/- from the company on the basis of forged documents
and did not pay the instalments.

It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the
petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. There is no allegation of
tampering of witnesses alleged against the petitioner. The petitioner



has falsely been implicated in the present case. The allegation of obtaining loan in question from the opposite party No.2 on the basis of forged document is denied by the petitioner. If the prosecution case be taken into consideration, at best the matter relates to civil dispute and the opposite party No.2 is at liberty to file a suit before the court below for recovery of the loan amount.

On behalf of the State and learned counsel for the opposite party No.2, it is submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. On behalf of opposite party No.2, Mrs. Prakritita Sharma, advocate, submits that the petitioner after obtaining the loan in question has not deposited the loan amount to the finance company.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is rejected.

If the petitioner surrenders before the court below and prays for regular bail, same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order. Further, if possible the court below shall dispose of the regular bail application of the petitioner preferably on the same day.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

Narendra/-

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

