

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31713 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-387 Year-2017 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

Jay Chandra Singh @ Jai Chand Singh Son Of Late Satan Singh R/o Village
Maricha Gohila P.S. Tajpur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Indresh Ray, Son of Late Jath Ray, Ro. Village+P.O.-Maricha, P.S.-Tajpur
(Halai O.P.) District-Samastipur. Pin-848504.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Surya Narayan Roy,Advocate
	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Anil Kumar, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Manu Kumar, Adcoate.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

8 12-12-2022 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to

remove the defect (s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within

a period of four weeks from today.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned

counsel for the informant and learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406,420 of

IPC and Section 138 of N.I.Act.

The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioner

was indebted Rs.90,000/- (Rs.Ninety Thousand) of the

informant. On demand, petitioner gave a cheque amounting



Rs.90,000/-(Rs.Ninety Thousand) which bounced on 10.11.2017 which shows petitioner gave frivolous cheque intentionally to deceive him and misappropriated his money by forgery.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent. He has falsely been implicated in the present case.

Vide order dated 27.09.2022 the learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted that the petitioner is ready to make payment of the entire amount of Rs.90,000/- (Rs.Ninety Thousand) to the informant within a period of three months in three equal monthly installments payable upto 10th of each month and the matter was directed to be listed after three months.

Today when the matter was called for, the learned counsel for the petitioner has shown his unwillingness to pay the amount in question to the informant.

Learned counsel for the informant and learned A.P.P. for the State have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Tajpur (Halai O.P.) P.S.Case No.387 of 2017



pending in the court of learned A.C.J.M.-1st, Samastipur.
Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

