

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7635 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-5105 Year-2019 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Neelam Kumari D/O Arjun Pandit, Wife of Pramod Kumar Resident of
Mohalla- Near Shiv Mandir, Khashganj, P.S.-Soh Sarai, Distt.-Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shakuntala Devi Wife of Late Ramashish Prasad Resident of 1119/A 6,
Krishi Nagar, A.G. Colony, P.O.-Ashiyana Nagar, P.S.-Shastri Nagar, Distt.-
Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Nandu Kumar Yadav, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Madhuri Lata, APP
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 28-06-2024 Heard learned counsels for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a complaint case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 120B, 406, 34, 323, 341, 504, 379 and 327 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, complainant is 70 years old widow lady and this petitioner, along with co-accused persons, without being sure about the fate of the company, invested an amount of Rs. 4,01,400/- of the complainant in Prayag Info Tech Hi Rise Limited and thereafter, the company became bankrupt and the assets of the company were liquidated



to repay the money of the investors.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the complainant voluntarily invested her money in the aforesaid company on the request of her co-relatives and this petitioner has got no role to play in the investment. Petitioner is simply an agent and has got no concern with the alleged investment made by the petitioner. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. On the other had, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and submitted that this petitioner has taken a sum of Rs. 4,01,400/- from the complainant and when after lapse of 4 years the complainant demanded the money back, this petitioner came out with these documents in order to show that the alleged money has been invested in the Prayag Info Tech Hi Rise Limited.

6. Considering the rival submissions and nature of accusation, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

