

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3527 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-452 Year-2020 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

PAPPU RAI Son of Lalan Rai Resident of Village - Belka, P.s.- Vaishali in the
Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ranjeet Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 05-08-2022 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 Mr.
Nirmal Kumar Sinha, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Mahua P.S. Case No. 452 of 2020, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 413, 414, 467, 468, 471, 420, 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

As per FIR, the police got a confidential information that a
miscreant who is involved in ATM fraud cases and also involved in
smuggling of psychotropic substances is present near Mangru
Chowk. The police party went there and apprehended that person
who disclosed his name as Laxman Kumar. His bag was searched
and 1 kg 30 gms of charas was recovered from his bag. Three ATM



Cards and a Laptop were also recovered. He disclosed that he along with his brother used to withdraw money from changing the ATM Cards of the persons and on that day after committing ATM fraud he had withdrawn money. He has also submitted that the present petitioner who is brother of the apprehended accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner was not arrested at the spot. Nothing was recovered from his possession and apprehended accused has named the present petitioner.

It has been mentioned in the impugned order that in supervision note of Dy.S.P. the involvement of the present petitioner was found in the present case and the investigation is still continuing. As such, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

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	
---	--	---	--

