

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4772 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-23 Year-2022 Thana- SAHAR District- Bhojpur

-
1. MANORANJAN KUMAR MAYANK Son of Ramadhar Rai R/v- Perhap, P.S.- Sahar, District- Bhojpur
 2. RASHMI KUMARI Wife of Manoranjan Kumar Mayank R/v- Perhap, P.S.- Sahar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhaskar Shankar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mohammed Arif, APP.

Mr. Jai Prakash Verma, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 27-02-2023 Heard the parties.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Allegedly, petitioners, along with other accused persons, having conspiracy looted money in name of company.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. No such occurrence as alleged ever took place. Petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case due to ulterior motive. The allegation levelled against the petitioners is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He further submits that the



occurrence took place in 2017, but the informant lodged this case in 2022. She did not spell a word about her transaction with company started in year 2011. She received payment several times after maturity of her deposit. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the son of the informant, namely, Dhananjay Kumar was also agent of Sankalp Company. But after the death of the informant's husband, the petitioner got appointment for the post of Teacher in place of her father. He further submits that the Director of the company has already been in judicial custody. Petitioners have no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that petitioner no.1 took Rs. 1,90,000/- and Rs. 5,00,000/- from the informant to deposit it in 'Sankalp Srijan Company in the year 2017. Thereafter, deposit certificate of company was also given to her but even after maturity of scheme, she did not receive money.

Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as nature of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. The prayer for bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected. However, if the petitioners surrender before the learned Court



below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail, the learned Court below shall pass order in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order on the very date of surrender.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

divyanshi/-

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

