

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57168 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-450 Year-2020 Thana- MUFFASIL District- West Champaran

ANTU KUMAR S/o Rajdev Raut Resident of Avaraiya Mouje Tola, P.S.-
Banuchhapar O.P., District- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

4 10-05-2022 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in a case registered under sections 420 and 406 of the Indian Penal Code.

As per the prosecution case, it is stated by the informant who is a District Co-ordinator of Sanjivni Vikas Foundation and whose N.G.O. provides banking facilities in Urban and Rural areas that the accused persons including Amod Kumar Mishra as also the Assistant of the said Co-ordinator ie the petitioner herein cheated various account holders. Complaints were made by the customers in the office of the informant and the F.I.R. registered.



It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that from perusal of the F.I.R. itself, it was Amod Kumar Mishra who was the Co-ordinator and there is no post of Sah Sanchalak which the petitioner is said to be. The main allegation is against Amod Kumar Mishra who has himself been enlarged on bail vide order dated 27.7.2021 (Annexure 2) passed in B.P.no.2402 of 2021. The F.I.R. does not speak about any specific amount nor any specific allegation is made against this petitioner. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is in custody since 15.7.2021.

The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State who submits that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R. with direct allegation against him and the allegation has been supported by the individual investors that they had given different amounts to the petitioner. Reference is made to paragraph nos.11, 12, 13, 19, 20 and 21 of the case diary.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegation against the petitioner and the material that has transpired in course of investigation including the paragraphs referred to above, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.



Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer
for bail after six months.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

Saurabh/-

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

