

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39530 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-366 Year-2021 Thana- BYPASS District- Patna
=====

SATISH KUMAR SINGH @ BABLOO SINGH S/O RAM NARESH SINGH R/O
Ward No. 15, Baru Raj Tola Bankat, P.S- Baru Raj, Distt.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Sinha Mr. Satendra Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Shailendra Kumar
For the Informant	:	Mr. Prabhat Kumar Munna Mr. Jagjit Roushan

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 16-10-2023 Heard Mr. Vijay Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Shailendra Kumar, learned A.P.P. for

the State as well as Mr. Prabhat Kumar Munna, learned

counsel for the informant.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection

with Bypass P.S. Case No. 366 of 2021 registered for the

offence under Sections 420, 406, 467, 469, 120B of the

Indian Penal Code.

The prosecutrix alleged that he on the mediation of

one Shashi Kumar Mishra has transferred Rs. 8,42,520/- in

the company account of the petitioner for supply of sponge

iron but the petitioner has not supplied the goods against



the transferred amount and refused to get his money back.

Considering the submission of the petitioner that the petitioner has delivered the goods as against the amount in question to the informant and the informant has issued no object certificate in this regard, which is out-rightly denied by the counsel for the informant stating that the informant has not received any goods in lieu of his money and he has stated that he has been cheated by the petitioner in connivance of one Shashi Kumar Mishra by misappropriating his money to the tune of Rs. Rs. 8,42,520/-, this Court is of the opinion that since the transfer of amount is question is admitted by the petitioner which itself constitute a *prima facie* case against the petitioner and for the purpose of grant of anticipatory bail, the Court is only required to see whether a *prima facie* case is made out or not. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

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

