

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.532 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-46 Year-2023 Thana- PARASI District- Jehanabad

Nathun Singh S/O LATE BHIKHAR SINGH VILLAGE- BABHAN BIGHA,
PS. PARASI, DIST. ARWAL.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. PARSHURAM PANDEY S/O LATE RAGHUNANDAN PANDEY
VILLAGE- BABHAN BIGHA, PS. PARASI, DIST. ARWAL.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Paras Nath, Advocate
For the O.P. No.2	:	Mr. Bijay Bardhan Pandey, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

- 3 18-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P.
for the State assisted by learned counsel for the opposite party
no.2.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Parasi P.S. Case No.
46 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections
406, 420 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. The petitioner is said to have taken Rs.3,07,000/- from the
informant by different modes as a loan and refused to return the
same.
4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that no
such occurrence as alleged ever took place. He has been falsely
implicated in this case due to village politics. It is further



submitted that the cheque numbers and amount referred in the F.I.R. has not been paid to the petitioner on any point of time. It is further submitted that only with an intention to extort money, this false and frivolous case has been lodged against the petitioner. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. Petitioner has one criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State assisted by learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 vehemently opposing the bail petition submitted that the petitioner has taken Rs.3,07,000/- as a loan by different modes and when the informant asked to return the said amount he was given threat. Learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 further submitted that during the course of investigation the informant has produced the evidence regarding the aforesaid payment. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case as well as the fact that the opposite party no.2 has produced a copy of his bank statement regarding the evidence that he has paid the said amount, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the



petitioner is hereby rejected. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the learned Court below within six weeks from today and seek regular bail, the learned Court below would pass order on the same day in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Trivedi/-

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

