

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71674 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-442 Year-2020 Thana- AURANGABAD TOWN District-
Aurangabad

=====

JITENDRA KUMAR @ JITENDRA KUMAR SINGH @ JITENDRA
SINGH S/o Harihar Singh Resident of Village - Kona, P.S. - Rafiganj, District
- Aurangabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The state of Bihar through Vigilance, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Krishna Prasad Singh, Sr. Advocate Mr. Bhaskar Shankar
For the State	:	Mr. Uma Shankar Prasad Singh, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Anil Singh

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

5 16-01-2023 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to
remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within
one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner,
learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for the
Vigilance.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the
offences alleged under Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption
Act, registered in connection with Special Case No. 30 of 2020
arising out of Aurangabad (Town) P.S. Case No. 442 of 2020.

Co-accused Ravindra Kumar Singh is a revenue
karamcharit and the petitioner is his assistant. As per allegation,
a video clip became viral, in which the petitioner was
demanding the bribe for co-accused Ravindra Kumar Singh.
Ravindra Kumar Singh was also seen with the petitioner in that
video clip.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that he is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case.
The petitioner is not his assistant, rather he is a private person.



He has submitted further that the provision of Section 7 of the P.C.Act is not attracted against the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the Vigilance have submitted that the petitioner was demanding money for co-accused Ravindra Kumar Singh, who was a revenue *karamchari* and anticipatory bail of Ravindra Kumar Singh has been rejected by this Court. They have submitted further that the petitioner is absconding and the case is still under investigation.

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

If the petitioner surrenders before the court below and makes a prayer for regular bail, the same shall be considered and disposed of without being prejudiced by this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

