

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8310 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2021 Thana- GAUTAMBUDHNAGAR District-
Siwan

=====

RAMUCHIT KUMAR Son of Sri Nathun Raut Resident of Village - Nandan
Bigha, Ward No.01, P.O.- Murgaon, P.s.- Hulasganj, Distt.- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :	Mr.Rohit Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s :	Mr. J.N.Thakur
	Mr.Ram Sumiran Rai

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 01-09-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the

offences alleged under Sections 406, 409 and 420 of the Indian

Penal Code, registered in connection with G.B.Nagar P.S.Case

No. 167 of 2021.

As per allegation, when a development programme

was going on sponsored by the World Bank under Rural

Livelihood Project Mission in the district of Siwan for the



upliftment of Rural Jeevika Samposit Samuha, the petitioner was community coordinator and there is allegation that he collected Rs.23,16,120/- from Jeevika Mitras and he did not deposit that amount in the Bank.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it was the duty of the informant being the Manager of the Project to deposit that amount in the Bank and he has falsely implicated the petitioner in this case as he was an employee at the lowest pedestal in the Institution.

On the other hand, Mr. J.N.Thakur, learned APP has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the FIR has been lodged on the basis of letters written by 12 women Jeevikas with the allegation that the petitioner collected money from them and he did not deposit it in the Bank. It was the petitioner in whose hand the money was given and there is allegation that he defalcated the entire money. The witnesses in paragraph nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 have supported the prosecution case.

Considering the above facts and circumstances, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. Prayer for anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by



the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

