

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1164 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9285 Year-2022 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Reena Devi W/O Bikash Kumar Sahoo Director Of M/S N.R.K.L Service India Pvt. Ltd. Quarter No. S3/L2-31 Iind Floor Gopabandhu Nagar Kalinga Bihar Raurkela Sundargarh (ODISHA), R/O Village/Mohalla- Market Basti Section 21, Ps. Chhend, Dist. Raurkela (ODISHA)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. M/S Radiant Enterprises A Partnership Firm Having Its H/O At Abhay Enclave Nawab Bagh Colony Police Line Road Tilka Manjhi, Ps. Tilkamanjhi, Dist. Bhagalpur Branch Office At C/O Ashok Aggarwal, Vidhayak Colony, Kautilya Nagar Ps. Hawaii Adda B.M.P 10 Dist. Patna Through Its Partner Gautam Kumar Aged About 42 Years S/O Late Abhay Kumar Yadav.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vinay Kumar Mishra
For the State	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar
For the Complainant	:	Mr. Santosh Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

5 18-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the complainant has transferred Rs.55,57,000/- in the bank account of companies thought R.T.G.S., namely, M/S Titan Glow India Pvt. Ltd. and M/S N.R.K.L Services India Pvt. Ltd. which is run by the



petitioner and other co-accused persons for supplying of electronics and electrical goods in connection with business transactions specific for distributorship. Further, the accused persons has failed to send the electronic goods of Rs.18,01,207/- to the complainant as well as they had also denied to sell the electronics goods of Rs.16,59,806/- which was laying in the godown more over the accused persons block the Rs.34,60,000/- of the complainant in business transactions fraudulently and violated the terms and conditions of the distribution agreement.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He submits that it is business dispute between the parties which is of civil nature. He further submits that there is no transactions in favour of the petitioner rather all amount has been paid through R.T.G.S. to the company. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the complainant opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, arguments of the parties and the fact that it is



business/money dispute between the parties, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Complaint Case No. 9285 of 2022, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

