

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47086 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-120 Year-2021 Thana- GOPALGANJ TOWN District-
Gopalganj

=====

PRAVEEN PATHAK @ PARVEEN PATHAK S/O MAHATMA KUMAR
PATHAK Resident of Sadhu Chak, Sareya, P.S.- Gopalganj, District-
Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vishwajeet Kumar Mishra, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

3 05-07-2022 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 Mr.
Shailendra Kumar, learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Gopalganj P.S. Case No. 120 of 2021, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 416, 420, 465, 405, 34 of the Indian Penal
Code.

The petitioner is admittedly an employee of Bajaj
Alliance Life Insurance Company Limited, Branch- Gopalganj on the
post of Customer Service Representative. As per allegation, in
collusion with co-accused Seema Devi, the petitioner being the
employee of the Company facilitated her in issuing a policy in the



name of her husband, Late Ram Bahadur Giri after the death of said Ram Bahadur Giri. The proposal for the policy was made on 10.04.2020 whereas the said Ram Bahadur Giri had died in a train accident on 22.10.2019, i.e. much prior to the insurance of the policy.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though the petitioner is an employee of the Company but he is not beneficiary of the alleged misdeed. He was made a scapegoat by the superior authorities of the Insurance Company.

Per contra, the learned Addl.P.P., Sri Shailendra Kumar, has submitted that the petitioner is the person who was to examine the documents relating to the insurance policy and on his report the policy was issued.

The FIR shows itself that the petitioner was duty bound to make a report after inquiry and only on the basis of that report the policy is issued. It appears that the policy was issued on the basis of wrong report of the petitioner. As such, I do not think it to be a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner 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	
---	--	---	--



