

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37612 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-138 Year-2019 Thana- KOCHAS District- Rohtas

=====

Amarjeet Kumar, Son Of Rajendra Singh Resident Of Vill - Salathua, P.S. -
Kudara, District - Kaimur.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Pandey

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Gulnar Begum

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 22-06-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in
a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 420
of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66D of the Information
and Technology Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that he has an account in Bank of India, Parsathua Branch. It is
next alleged that on 30.05.2019, the informant withdrew the
money from ATM and a message was received on his mobile,
thereafter received further message of withdrawal on the next
day. Accordingly, he went to the bank and informed that an
account of Rs.25,455/- has wrongly been deducted from his
account.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. During the course of investigation, the mobile number of the petitioner was tracked with the help of which, the money is alleged to have been deducted from the account of the informant. Learned counsel submits that though the mobile is in the name of the petitioner, but the same was being misused by his cousin brother Tinku Kumar, who is a habitual offender.

Learned A.P.P. opposes the bail application and submits that the petitioner only with a view to secure anticipatory bail is making such submission when admittedly, the mobile number belongs to the petitioner. It is next submitted that such crime are rampant and persons like petitioner should be dealt severely and they should not be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

