IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6685 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-163 Year-2018 Thana- GOH District- Aurangabad

==

VINOD RAJAK Son of Late Kameshwar Rajak R/o Village - Dosma/Dosmaha, P.s. Deo, District - Aurangabad.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party

==

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Ms.Mukul Kumari
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Nath Jha

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

2 25-08-2022 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 learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Goh P.S. Case No. 163 of 2018, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

The wife of the informant was admitted in AIIMS Delhi where the brother of the petitioner was also admitted for treatment. The informant and the present petitioner were attendants of their respective patients. They came into contact in Delhi and the petitioner assured him to secure a government job for the son of the informant on payment of rupees five lacs. After death of the informant's wife he came to the village and after Shradhh ceremony of his wife, the petitioner along with one Yogendra Yadav came to the house of the informant. The informant gave rupees five lacs to them and thereafter an appointment letter was received by the informant in the name of his son issued by the Government of Bihar. The petitioner asked the informant to go to Collectorate Office in Arwal and let his son join there. When the informant went to the Collectorate Office, Arwal and produced the appointment letter, he was apprised that it was fake and forged. The petitioner firstly made evasion in returning money but on persistent demand he deposited Rs. 30,000/- in his account and denied to make payment of rest amount.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that Rs. 30,000/- deposited by the petitioner in the account of the informant was at his request for the treatment of his wife. She has also submitted that petitioner is innocent.

As per allegation, the petitioner extorted money from the informant at the false pretext of providing job to his son. He issued a fake and forged appointment letter. As such, in my view, it is not a fit case for 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	