

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66809 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-334 Year-2019 Thana- PATLIPUTRA District- Patna

DEEPAK KUMAR Son of Dinesh Sharma Resident of Village- Dariyapur,
P.O.- Belkhara, P.S.- Rampur Chauram, District- Arwal (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhairaw Nand Sharma

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Pandey

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

ORAL ORDER

3 06-02-2023 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 learned APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Patliputra P.S. Case No. 334 of 2019, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120 B of the Indian Penal Code.

During investigation it emerged that the petitioner appeared in second shift of examination for the post of MTS conducted by Staff Selection Commission. He also appeared in the third shift of the said examination impersonating one Pankaj Kumar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that this fact has wrongly been emerged in the investigation that the petitioner had appeared on behalf of one Pankaj Kumar in the



examination impersonating him. As a matter of fact, the photographs of both the persons were found same and on this basis only the petitioner has falsely been implicated and he is a person of clean antecedent.

On the other hand, the learned APP has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that it has been mentioned in paragraph No. 28 of the case diary that the signature of the petitioner was tallied which was same as his signature in second shift which shows that the petitioner appeared on behalf of Pankaj Kumar in the examination. The petitioner has been debarred for seven years from appearing in the examination conducted by SSC.

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

If, the petitioner surrenders before the court below and make a prayer for regular bail. His regular bail petition shall be considered without being prejudiced by this order.

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	
---	--	---	--

