

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36869 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-970 Year-2023 Thana- LAKHISARAI District- Lakhisarai

Bittu Kumar SON OF BHARAT RAM R/O VILLAGE- AMHRA, P.S.-
AMHRA, DIST- Lakhisarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajnish Chandra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shailendra Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 25-09-2024 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. This is an application for regular bail on behalf of the petitioner for the offences alleged under Sections 420, 379, 467 and 468 of the Indian Penal Code registered in connection with Lakhisarai (Amhara) P.S.Case No. 970 of 2023.

3. As per the FIR, co-accused Suraj Kumar was running a C.S.P. He misappropriated money from the customers of the Bank. As per the allegation, *farzi* entries in the passbooks were made and fabricated receipts were provided to the customers. The informant, who was also one of the customers, was cheated. Ultimately, Suraj Kumar disappeared.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated. Nothing was recovered from his possession. He has also submitted that in Lakhisarai (Amhra) P.S.Case No. 969 of 2023 he is on bail.



5. On the other hand, the learned APP for the State, while drawing my attention towards para-18 of the case diary (wrongly mentioned as 38), has submitted that the petitioner was also working in the C.S.P. and after absconding of the main accused, Suraj Kumar, the petitioner started running the C.S.P. One of the customers Niranjan Kumar has stated in para-18 of the case diary that when he went to the C.S.P., Suraj Kumar was not present there and the petitioner was operating that C.S.P. Niranjan Kumar withdrew Rs. 20,000/-but he was paid only Rs.10,000/- and the petitioner assured that rest amount shall be paid the next day. When the next day, this witness went to C.S.P., he refused to pay the amount. In para-19 of the case diary, the witness Dinesh Yadav has stated that the petitioner fled away after taking money of the customers.

6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner the privilege of bail, which is hereby rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

