

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.21797 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-821 Year-2020 Thana- MUZAFFARPUR TOWN District-
Muzaffarpur

=====

UMESH KUMAR S/o Ram Suhag Prajapati R/o village- Yamunapur, P.S.-
Bihta, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Surendra Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

3 09-01-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove

all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within one

month.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri.
Shailendra Kumar, learned Addl.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Muzaffarpur Town P.S. Case No. 821 of 2020, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 475, 420, 120 B of
the Indian Penal Code.

Two vehicles bearing same registration number were
plying on road. An enquiry was conducted and it is found that one
vehicle was registered in the name of Sudha Devi and other
vehicle was registered in the name of Sujit Sah. The registration
number of the vehicle of Sudha Devi was found fake.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the



petitioner is a data entry operator in DTO Office deputed by Beltron and he is not responsible for issuing the fake registration certificate.

On the other hand, Sri Shailendra Kumar, the learned Addl. P.P. has submitted that paragraph No. 17 and 18 of case diary itself shows that an organized gang is conducting such type of offence and on previous occasions also the petitioner was involved in similar type of offence to which the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in earlier case the petitioner has taken the plea of alibi.

Paragraph No. 17 and 18 of the case diary shows itself that the petitioner is involved with an organized gang. There is another case on earlier occasion against the petitioner. Investigation is still going on.

In my view, it is not a fit case for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time provided in para-1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

SONALI/-

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

