

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47237 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-204 Year-2015 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

AMRENDRA PRASAD SINGH S/o Sri Arun Kumar Singh Resident at Flat
No. 301, Devendra Plaza, Road No. 03, Mahesh Nagar, P.O.- L.B.S. Nagar,
P.S.- Patliputra, District- Patna- 800023

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Umesh Thakur S/o Late Shiv Narayan Thakur R/o village- Raghurampur,
P.O.- Chandmari, P.S.- Shahpur, District- Patna, Pin Code- 801503

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 03-01-2023 Heard Mr. Arun Kumar Singh, learned counsel for

the petitioner and the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with complaint Case No. 204(C) of 2015 for the offence
registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal
Code and Section 138 of the N.I. Act.

As per the allegation in the FIR, the accused persons
offered the complainant and others unemployed person to work
in the company and thereafter also took money for fixed deposit
but when the maturity period came, not only he abused the
complainant and other persons, they also disappeared from the
scene. Accordingly, the present case has been lodged.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that save and except incorporation of his name as an AGM, Danapur Branch of the said company, there is nothing on record to show his actual involvement. Further, the allegation of issuance of cheque is on other accused persons. The last submission is that one Vishnu Dayal Choudhary was granted the relief of anticipatory bail vide in Cr. Misc. No. 42729 of 2018 vide order dated 14.09.2018.

Learned APP for the State, on the other hand, opposes the prayer stating that these kind of companies robbed the hard earned money of the innocent people and thereafter disappear and in that background, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Taking into account the fact that the allegation of issuance of cheque which subsequently bounced is/are on other accused persons, the petitioner has only been found to be an official of the said company and as per the FIR itself the company used to lure unemployed person to work, he too being its, victim, he do not have any criminal antecedent and one of the similarly placed co-accused has been extended the same relief, this Court is inclined to grant him relief.

Let the petitioner in the event of arrest or surrender



within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order, shall be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate-1st Class, Danapur, Patna in connection with complaint case no. 204(C) of 2015 subject to condition as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Jagdish/Neha/-

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

