

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49719 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-403 Year-2018 Thana- ROHTAS COMPLAINT CASE District-
Rohtas

=====

Vijay Kumar Singh S/o Late Triveni Singh R/O Village- Padwaria, PS-
Kargahar, Dist- Rohtas At present,R/O Village-Mokar,Baijala,P.S.-
Sasaram,Distt-Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Upendra Kumar Bharti S/O Pravesh Ram @ Ram Pravesh Ram R/O Village-
Kudari,P.S.-Karamchat(sabar), Distt-Kaimur Bhabhua

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Babu Nandan Prasad
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Syed Mojibur Rahman

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-09-2024 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 Section 406 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the complainant
alleges that this petitioner along with Shyam Narayan Pandey,
being agent of Senmarg Amit Finance Company, came and
induced the complainant to deposit Rs. 1,600/- per month for
four years or Rs. 10,000/- by way of lump sum and assured that
the benefit after four years would be five times of the amount



invested, accordingly, the complainant believing them started depositing Rs. 1,600/- per month since 2014 and the amount was to mature in the year 2018 but when the complainant went to deposit the money in the month of January 2018, he found that the company and the accused persons had fled away after misappropriating the money of the investors.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the complainant. It is next submitted that petitioner was an agent in the company and as part of duty had persuaded the complainant to invest in the company and was not aware that the Director of the Company would misappropriate the amount of innocent investors. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial.

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

6. 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 Rohtas Complaint Case P.S. Case No. 403 of 2018 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

