

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57036 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2019 Thana- PARSABAZAR District- Patna

=====

Zeenat Perveen Wife of Ravi Shankar Gupta Resident of Kharanja Road New
Tarachak, P.S-Danapur, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoranjan Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dashrath Mehta

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

8 15-02-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is expected

to honour his undertaking given in the instant case for

depositing the requisite court fee and to remove the

defects as pointed out by the office when called upon to

do so by the office.

The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in a

case registered for the offences punishable under

Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section

138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

The prosecution case as per F.I.R is that the



informant started his business with the proprietor of M/s Zeenat Export Company namely Ravi Shankar Gupta who is husband of the petitioner. It is alleged that during 28.08.2018 to 28.09.2018, the informant continued business with him, as a result of which, Rs. 28,22,562/- became due. It is further alleged that when the informant demanded his due amount, the husband of the petitioner sent a photocopy of cheque of Rs. 10,00,000/- on whatsapp and promised to send the same through courier. He also sent a second cheque of Rs. 16,00,000/- to the informant and when the informant went to the bank for its encashment, the same got bounced.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has not been named in the F.I.R and there is no direct allegation against the petitioner in the F.I.R. The informant has done his business with the husband of the petitioner and petitioner has no concern with the business affairs of her



husband.

From perusal of the F.I.R and after thoroughly examining the case diary, it is apparent that petitioner is also proprietor of M/s Zeenat Export Company with whom the informant has made transaction of Rs. 28,22,562 and the said amount has still not been paid to the informant.

Considering the aforestated facts, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

