

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13207 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-403 Year-2018 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

SHYAM NARAYAN PANDEY Son of Kamla Kant Pandey Resident of
Village - Manipur, P.s.- Nokha, Distt.- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. UPENDRA KUMAR BHARTI Son of Pravesh Ram @ Ram Pravesh Ram
Resident of Village - Kudari, P.s.- Karamchat (Sabar), Distt.- kaimur
(Bhabhua).

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajani Kant Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mukeshwar Dayal

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

10 28-06-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel for the

complainant.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467,

468, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

The complainant alleges that this petitioner along with

Vijay Kumar Singh being agent of Sanmarg Amit Finance came

and induce the complainant to deposit Rs. 1,600/- per month for

four years or Rs. 10,000/- by way of lump sum and assured that

the benefit after four years would be five times of the amount,

accordingly, the complainant believing them started depositing



Rs. 1,600/- per month since 2014 and the amount was to mature in the year 2018 but when the complainant went to deposit the money in the month of January 2018, he found that the company and the accused persons had fled away after misappropriating his money.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the petitioner has resigned from the company in the year 2016 itself, it is further submitted that from essay of the complainant, it would manifest that he has specifically alleged that it was Vijay who had come to his house and persuaded him to invest in the company, it is next submitted that the complainant does not even remotely whispers that the investment was made in pursuance of the assurance given by the petitioner.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner but are not able to rebut the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner with respect to the statement recorded of the complainant in her essay.



Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Rohtas Complaint Case P.S. Case No. 403 of 2018 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

