

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6044 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-177 Year-2023 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Shashi Bhushan Singh Son of Bijuli Singh Resident of Village- Semra, P.S.-
Chakia, Distt.- East Champaran, Motihari

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sharda Nand Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

4 03-05-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the State
and the informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 177 of 2023 instituted under Sections 379, 406, 407, 420 of the Indian Penal Code lodged on 7.6.2023 by the informant, Ajeet Kumar Gupta.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that 299.70 quintal of rice worth Rs. 8,39,160/- was sent through the company of the petitioner (Sri Mangal Transport Company) for which Rs. 74,925/- was also paid to him. However, the truck never reached the destination and upon enquiry, he failed to give any satisfactory reply. As request failed to cut any ice, the FIR.

4. On 9.4.2024, when this Court was not inclined to extend any benefit to the petitioner considering the allegation



that has come against him, the learned counsel for the petitioner took time to inquire from the petitioner regarding payment of the amount (Rs. 8,39,160/-).

5. Today on call, it is his submission that no positive response was thereon on the part of the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner being the transporter, cannot be implicated in the matter.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant on the other hand has taken this Court to the order of the learned Sessions Judge to show that he had a role in the entire episode and the learned Sessions Judge has quoted different paragraphs as also the supervision note of the Dy.S.P. to show that against this petitioner also the case has been found to be true.

7. In that background, this Court is not inclined to extend him any relief and the anticipatory bail application accordingly stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

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

