

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1311 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-547 Year-2019 Thana- MOTIHARI District- East Champaran

=====

YOGENDRA YADAV @ SADHU YADAV Son of Late Gagan Yadav
Resident of Village - Patjirwa, P.S. - Sirisiya, District - West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr. Anuj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. Ram Anurag Singh
	Mr. Karandeep Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

12 28-06-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as

learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the

informant.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection

with Motihari Town P.S. Case No. 547 of 2019, registered for

the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 406,

420/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation, the informant runs a company

named M.H.T Developers Private Ltd. And he is C.M.D of the

said company and its registered office is in Mohalla Sri Krishna



Nagar, East Champaran. The petitioner Yogendra Yadav @ Sadhu Yadav and co-accused Manoj Mishra, were agents of the said company and both the accused persons executed an agreement with the company on 09.08.2018 that 40 Bigha land at village Guruwaliya Biswas, Thana No. 125, District-West Champaran on Bettiah-Bagaha Road will be made available from the farmers by them and both the accused persons took Rs. 1,11,95,000/- from the informant but after lapse of considerable duration, both the accused persons failed to execute the sale deed by the farmers.

Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks some time which is not possible as already a number of adjournments have been given.

Learned Addl. P.P., Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, has submitted, at the outset, that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents in paragraph No. 3 of his bail petition. In paragraph No. 26 of the case diary, his criminal antecedents has been mentioned but he has not disclosed it in Paragraph No. 3 of the bail petition.

The petitioner did not come before this court with clean hands as he has concealed his criminal antecedents, as such, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.



Accordingly, it is rejected.

The Registrar General is directed to take appropriate action after conducting an inquiry against the erring persons.

List the matter after six weeks.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

SONALI/-

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

