

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52292 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-214 Year-2019 Thana- CHHATAPUR District- Supaul

Ramanand Singh Son of Late Sitaram Singh Resident of Village- Rajdham,
P.S.- Mahesh Khunt, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmeshwar Mehta

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

3 12-05-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a
case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 406, 409, 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

It is alleged against the petitioner that he in
connivance with Mukhiya, Panchayat Secretary and
others have defalcated the money which was meant for
implementation of various schemes of Gram Panchayat,
Rajeshwari West.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the
petitioner that at the relevant point of time, the



petitioner was posted as Junior Engineer and now he has retired. It is further submitted that for the cause of action of scheme of 2014-15, the F.I.R has been registered in the year 2019 without any cogent explanation of the delay. The petitioner has absolutely no role in sanction of the scheme. He has to do measurement after completion of work on instructions of Assistant Engineer.

Learned A.P.P appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submitted after going through the case diary that in Scheme No. 01/15-16, 03/14-15 the work has not been completed whereas in Scheme No. 02/15-16, no work has been done but the petitioner being Junior Engineer has certified that work has been completed.

Considering the fact that the petitioner being Junior Engineer had not discharged his official duties and defalcated the money of the government in connivance



with the Mukhiya, Panchayat Secretary and others, this
Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail
to the petitioner.

The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the
petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

