

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3392 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-474 Year-2021 Thana- NAGAR District- Vaishali

PRIYA RANJAN KUMAR Son of Shri Ayodhya Prasad Resident of Village -
postal park Kankarbagh, P.S.- Kankarbagh, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Udai Shankar Son of Late Chandeshwar Pd. Singh Resident of Village -
Krisna Appartment, Flat no.301, Behind Mahabir Mandir, P.s.- Rupaspur,
Distt.- Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Dinu Singh, Adv. Mrs.Ritika Rani, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr.Ram Sumiran Rai, APP
For the Bank	:	Mr.Prabhakar Jha, Adv. Mr.Mukund Mohan Jha, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

6 02-01-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel
for the Bank and learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove
the defect(s) as pointed out by the office within four weeks.

Petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Hajipur P.S. Case No.474/2021, registered for the offence u/s
420, 406, 467, 468, 471/34 of the IPC.

Allegation against the petitioner and other accused
persons is of defalcation of Rs.9,96,000/- from one Md.
Jaffaruddin Ansari.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that
petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. He



has been falsely implicated in this case due to politics. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent. It is submitted that petitioner is authorized agent of Instant Global Paytec Pvt. Ltd. and runs Cyber Zone as proprietor which is under conscious knowledge of the informant. The petitioner has two bank accounts in SBI Kankarbagh Branch being account no.32072291656 and 33883048771. Petitioner has also got industrial loan of Rs.10,40,000/- to operate account no.33883048771 for which petitioner is making monthly payment and paid GST and income tax. It is further submitted that there is no specific overt act against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant opposed the prayer for bail and submits that there is allegation against the petitioner and in the case diary, there is ample evidence against the petitioner.

Considering the nature of offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner named above on bail. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail on his behalf is rejected.

This application is accordingly dismissed.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

pallavi/-

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

