

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18597 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1595 Year-2018 Thana- MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

=====

Md. Washim @ Shekh Washim @ Shekh Vasim S/o Late Shekh Nishar
Ahmad R/o vill - Loharitola Marpatahir, P.s.- Bairagnia, Distt.- Sitamarhi, At
present Mohalla Data Kambal Sah Mazar, P.S.- Nagar, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Mohammad Naim @ Md. Nayeem S/o Md. Tashlim R/o Mohalla -
Chakbashu, Kachchi Sarai, P.S.- Mithanpura, Distt.- Muzaffarpur

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Ms.Nitu Kumari
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- | | | |
|---|------------|--|
| 2 | 08-04-2026 | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail, arises out
of Complaint Case No. 1595 of 2018, in which
cognizance has been taken for the offence punishable
under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code.3. The prosecution case, as per the complaint filed by Md.
Nayeem, is that on the assurance to arrange a job for the
complainant in Dubai, U.A.E., the petitioner has taken a
sum of Rs. 75,000/-. The petitioner has also taken a sum
of Rs. 25,000/- in the name of flight ticket and police |
|---|------------|--|



clearance certificate. The petitioner sent the complainant to Dubai on a tourist visa saying that when he would reach Dubai, his person will arrange for work visa. It is alleged that after 28 days of reaching Dubai, the petitioner and/or his man could not arrange the work visa for the complainant and later on, when the father of the complainant sent him the flight ticket, he returned to India.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to previous enmity with the complainant. He further submits that the petitioner was sent to Dubai, the flight ticket of which was provided by the petitioner to the complainant. Since the work visa could not be provided by the U.A.E. authorities, as such, the job could not be provided to the complainant.
5. Regards being had to the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegation and the fact that there is direct allegation that on the false assurance, the petitioner has taken a huge amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- and the petitioner is having criminal antecedents of similar nature of offence, I am not



inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	✓	T	✓
---	---	---	---

