

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81674 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-517 Year-2016 Thana- MUZZFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

-
1. Ishrat Parveen @ Israt Perween @ Chandni D/O Md. Mansur Ali Ansari @ Md. Mansur Ansari Mohalla- Mehendi Hasan Chauk, Brahmpura Ward No. 5, Lane In Front Of New Calcutta Hotel Ps. Brahmpura, Dist. Muzaffarpur
 2. Imran Ali @ Aman S/O Md. Mansur Ali Ansari @ Md. Mansur Ansari Mohalla- Mehendi Hasan Chauk, Brahmpura Ward No. 5, Lane In Front Of New Calcutta Hotel Ps. Brahmpura, Dist. Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shabbir Abbas S/O Gulam Abbas R/O- Ali Mirja Road, Nai Bazar, P.O- Head Post Office, Ps. Town, Dist. Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar Manoj
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 04-03-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel for the OP No. 2.

 2. The petitioners apprehends their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 407, 408, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

 3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, being the Cashier and Office Assistant of Green Ray International Company, have been implicated by the



informant, who was an investor, alleging that the company along with the accused persons committed fraud with their investors as they had promised that they will give high interest rate and good returns on investment made in the company, it is also alleged that the accused persons, including the petitioners, embezzled Rs. 20 lakhs of the investors, including the complainant.

4. The learned counsel submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the allegation against the petitioners is general and omnibus in nature. It is also submitted that it was not the petitioners who lured the investors to invest, rather the complainant along with other investors, after going through the documents of the company, showed their interest in investing and thus invested the amount through agents of the company. It is also submitted that it was not part of the duty of the petitioners to seek investment from the investors. It is next submitted that the petitioners will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation.

5. The learned APP along with learned counsel for the OP No. 2 opposes the anticipatory bail application but are not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel for the



petitioners that the petitioners had no role in getting investment invested in the company rather were working as Cashier and Office Assistant in the company.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their 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. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five Thousand) each 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 Muzaffarpur Complaint Case No. 517 of 2016 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event, if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned trial court bringing to its notice that the petitioners, despite giving assurance to this court, are not cooperating in the investigation, the learned trial court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

SUMIT/-

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

