

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53751 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-891 Year-2023 Thana- BODHGAYA District- Gaya

Mithlesh Kumar son of Arun Bind Village- Sonu Bigha, Ps- Bodh Gaya Dist-
Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sudhir Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anand Kishore Choudhary, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

3 20-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bodhgaya P.S. Case No. 891 of 2023 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120B, 467, 468/34
of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The allegation against the petitioner along with
others is said to have indulged in cheating of innocent common
people in the name of giving job by using social medial and
technology.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case.
The petitioner was not present at the spot. It is further submitted



that petitioner has no concern with the Karmapa temple Bodhgaya and Green Land Hotel in any manner. There is no specific allegation against the petitioner. Nothing incriminating has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Charge sheet has been submitted in this case. It is lasty submitted that co-accused has been allowed regular bail by this Court *vide* orders dated 18-04-2024 & 15-05-2024, passed in Cr. Misc. No. 27693 of 2024 & Cr. Misc. No. 36894 of 2024, respectively.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. It is submitted that co-accused, namely, Motilal in his confessional statement has stated that petitioner is the proprietor of the DHC Trading India Pvt. Ltd., which fact finds mention in paragraph No. 9 of the case diary.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and taking into account the material crept at paragraph No. 9 of the case diary, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail is *rejected*.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Raj Kishore/-

U			
---	--	--	--

