

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14671 of 2021

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38093 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2017 Thana- NOKHA District- Rohtas

=====

MANISH KUMAR RANJAN Son of Ram Kumar Sah @ Raj Kumar Sah
Resident of Village - Station Road, Nokha Near Hanuman Mandir, Ward
No.10, P.S.- Nokha, Distt.- Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. the Branch Manager, Bank of India, Nokha Branch, Rohtas, Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Fahimuddin, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 06-10-2021 It appears from the present application that the petitioner having obtained regular bail from this Court on giving an undertaking that after his release on bail he will deposit rest of the amount being Rs. 29,00,000/- in six monthly installments has failed to abide by his own promise on which he had obtained bail. The order was passed by this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 223 of 2018 on 12.01.2018. It appears that subsequently another Criminal Miscellaneous application was filed seeking modification of the said order and this Court having perused the application rejected the same taking note of the conduct of the petitioner. This has not deterred the petitioner from filing the second application seeking modification, while rejecting the



earlier application for modification, learned counsel for the petitioner was not present.

Today, Mr. Pancham Lal Jaiswal, learned counsel for the petitioner has pressed this application and he has come out with too many pleas to come out of the promise/offer made before this Court while seeking regular bail. One of the grounds is that petitioner wants to compromise the matter under the Rin Samadhan Yojana and the bank has not done anything till today in this respect, his rice mill was closed in 2016 and the bank is not helping.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for modification of the order as according to him the kind of prayer made by the petitioner by changing his lawyer for purpose of modification speaks further about his conduct. He having obtained bail by making an unconditional offer before this Court to refund the public money is now in fact looking for review of the order in the garb of the modification.

It is further submitted that from the whole tenor of the statements made on behalf of the petitioner, it may be found that the petitioner had planned to come out on bail making a false promise before this Court and having obtained bail now he is not willing to abide by the promise and then is also evading his



arrest.

This Court finds force in the submission of learned A.P.P. for the State. Prima facie, this Court finds that the petitioner had obtained bail from this Court after giving an unequivocal promise to make a payment of Rs. 5,00,000/- at the time of submission of bail bond and thereafter rest of the amount of Rs. 29,00,000/- in six monthly installments, the later part of the promise he has failed to abide by but has not surrendered and is moving at large for the last three years.

In the circumstances this Court calls upon the Superintendent of Police, Rohtas to execute the warrant of arrest already issued against the petitioner as it appears from his prayer and report to this Court by 22nd October, 2021.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rishi/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

