

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8109 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-154 Year-2016 Thana- CHAPRA TOWN District- Saran

Vijay Kumar Singh Son Of Shatrudhan Prasad Singh R/O Village- Itwa, P.S.-
Garkha, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhananjay Kumar Tiwary

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Lalan Kumar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

4 12-03-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 120B, 420,
406, 323, 504, 506, 467 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the notice on behalf of OP No. 2 was received by his son. It is
next submitted that an application of jointness has been filed.

4. In view of the submissions made by the learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, the notice is
deemed to have been validly served.

5. It is next submitted that the petitioner is a person
with clean antecedent and being the Manager of the company,
came to be implicated in the instant case by the informant with



an allegation that he had deposited an amount of Rs.1,70,000/- in the branch of the company of which the petitioner was the Branch Manager and when his amount matured and he wanted to withdraw, he was informed that the same has been converted into bonds and when the informant went to the branch for seeking his original documents and money, when the accused persons, including the petitioner, abused him, as such, he alleges that his amount has been usurped by the accused persons. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, being Branch Manager of the company. It is also submitted that being Branch Manager of the company, it was not the duty of the petitioner to seek investment, rather the investment was brought by other employees of the company. It is further submitted that the company has went under liquidation. It is also submitted that some of the employees of the company have been granted privilege of anticipatory bail by the learned district court itself, but the case of the petitioner was rejected solely on the grounds that he was Branch Manager of the company at the relevant time, when the occurrence took place.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.



7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Town P.S. Case No. 154 of 2016, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

