IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30033 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2020 Thana- DAWATH District- Rohtas

==

Sheo Shanker Singh Son Of Late Ugrasen Singh Resident of Village- Dolaicha, P.S.- Dawath, District- Rohtas

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 31937 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-155 Year-2020 Thana- DAWATH District- Rohtas

==

Sheo Shanker Singh Son of Late Ugrasen Singh Resident of Village- Dolaicha, P.S.- Dawath, District- Rohtas.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The State of Uttar Pradesh through its Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow, UP-226001
3. The Jail Superintendent, Mandal Kara, Lucknow, UP.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 30033 of 2023)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Siddharth Harsh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Aditya Nr. Singh-I, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 31937 of 2021)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Siddharth Harsh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.A.G

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

7 23-02-2024 **Re.: Cr. Misc. No. 30033 of 2023**

List this case before the appropriate Bench hearing the quashing applications.

2. The interim order shall continue.

Re.:Cr. Misc. No. 31937 of 2021

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner; learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

4. As per the F.I.R. based on the prosecution report of the informant Radha Singh, is that the petitioner who was agent of one Peers Allied Corporation Ltd. received handsome amount from the informant and other persons under monthly, half yearly, yearly fixed deposit scheme and Life Insurance Policy. On maturity of the fixed deposits, the petitioner handed over cheques of HDFC Bank to some persons but the same were dishonored. Later on, it was detected that the Company had no license to do banking and insurance business. The informant further alleged that the petitioner has cheated the informant and others.

5. The petitioner is an employee of the Company. The Directors of the Company have been made accused in the further investigation and charge-sheet has been submitted against them.

6. Since the petitioner was only an employee of the Company, this Court finds it a fit case for grant of regular bail. The petitioner is already on provisional bail in terms of order dated 25.04.2022.

7. In these circumstances, this application is allowed.

8. The provisional bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 25.04.2022 is hereby confirmed. The petitioner will remain on bail on the same bail bonds executed by him pursuant to the interim bail granted earlier.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

P. Kumar

U		T	