

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75330 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2024 Thana- Bhawanipur District- Bhagalpur

=====

Ranjeet Singh @ Ranjit Kumar Singh S/O Kailash Singh Resident of Village-
Satish Nagar P.S- Pasraha, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Dilip Kumar Singh S/O Late Ratneshwar Pd. Singh R/O Village- Balaha,
P.S- Bhawanipur, Distt.- Bhagalpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Santosh Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Choubey Jawahar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

9 15-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with

Bhawanipur P.S. Case No. 99 of 2024, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 420, 406, 408, 120(B) of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the informant hired

Ranjeet Kumar Singh (the petitioner) as Manager-cum-
Nosalman in the year 2016 at his newly opened petrol pump. In
2018, the informant became ill and remained ill for three years.

The allegation against the petitioner is that he defalcated Rs.
18,54,387.47 in one year. Further, the informant alleges that the



petitioner has committed defalcation for five to six years.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He has further submitted that POS machine has not been seized. The informant is owner of the petrol pump. The bank has not been made as a party. The learned counsel has submitted that the criminal antecedent of the petitioner is not of the similar nature.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the statement of the bank attached to this petition, shows theft committed by the petitioner. The witnesses in paragraph nos. 6 to 9 have supported the prosecution case. Moreover, the petitioner is not ready to return the money.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, it is *rejected*.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

Nirmal/Kundan

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

