

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-757 Year-2021 Thana- NALANDA COMPLAINT CASE
District- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- Opposite Party/s

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2024 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 757^C/2021 for the offence under Sections 420 of the I.P.C. filed on 28.09.2021 by the complainant, Shaista Anjum.

3. As per the complaint, the complainant alleged that she had applied for the post of Assistant Technical Manager under Agriculture Department, Bihar vide Advertisement No. 0055188/2019 and the counseling done on 28.01.2019 on the District Agriculture Office, Nalanda, Bihar Sharif.

4. She further complaining that this petitioner met



her and assured that he being the employee of the Agriculture Department having connection with the higher officials can assure her job. Accepting his words, Rs. 2,00,000/- was paid on 24.09.2019, later, when the list of the Agriculture Department came, her name was missing, she wanted her money back but the petitioner switched off the mobile. Accordingly, the complaint.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that he is not a regular employee of the Agriculture Department rather working on ad hoc basis. Further, only to put pressure, the complaint has been made and there is nothing on record to show of any payment made.

6. Learned APP, on the other hand, submits that the allegation is of the year 2019 and the cognizance taken in the year 2021 and three years later, the present anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner. He has further taken this Court to the order-sheet of the learned Sessions Judge, Nalanda, Bihar Sharif to show that the complainant showed the video from her mobile, in which, the petitioner is counting the money.

7. There is nothing in the anticipatory bail petition to show that the observation made by the learned Sessions Judge while rejecting the prayer of the petitioner is incorrect. This



Court has also taken note of the fact that the allegation is of the year 2019 and the complaint is of the year 2021.

8. In the aforesaid background, when the accused choose to offer an appointment which was not within his domain, extracted Rs. 2,00,000/- from the complainant, the video is on record, he has delayed coming to this Court, no relief can be granted to him.

9. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Guddu/-

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

