

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15399 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-411 Year-2020 Thana- GHOSI District- Jehanabad

RAM SEVAK SINGH Son of Late Hukum Singh Residence of Village -
Kakhaura, P.S. - Sakurabad, Dist.- Jehanabad, The ex panchayat Sachiv
Modanganj, Jehanabad Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nitya Nand Neeraj
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Aditya Narayan Singh.1

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

4 23-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP
for the State.

The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed
by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Ghoshi
P.S. Case no. 411 of 2020 instituted for the offence punishable under
Sections 406, 409, 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per allegation in the FIR, petitioner is Panchayat
Secretary and he in connivance of accused Shyam Nandan Sharma
being ex Mukhiya had constructed the community hall on personal
land of his co-villager, namely, Ravindra Sharma and misused the
government fund amounting to Rs. 3,82,650/-.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has
submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence.
There is no legal evidence against the petitioner even of transaction
of money. M.V. book was prepared by the engineer. Anchal Adhkari
and Anchal Amin is totally responsible for demarcation over the



proposed land and not the petitioner and petitioner is being made scape goat. Apart from this fact, Ravindra Sharma has not raised any objection for making construction on his private land.

Learned counsel for the informant and learned APP appearing for the State have opposed the prayer of bail and submitted that inspite of making a community hall, in connivance with the petitioner, construction of residential house has been done in which Ravindra Sharma is residing. Informant in his re-statement at para 5 and during investigation, several witnesses in para 13 and 17 of the case diary have supported the prosecution story.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration that petitioner is involved in embezzlement of government money, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and, as such, his application for bail is rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

sushma/-

U			
---	--	--	--

