

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38821 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-528 Year-1999 Thana- PATNA COMPLAINT CASE District-
Patna

=====

Ram Pravesh Yadav @ Ram Pravesh Prasad, aged about 51 years, S/O Late
Bhola Yadav, Resident of Ganjpar, P.S- Rajgir, Dist.- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Chandra Deo Yadav Son of Late Par Meshwar Yadav Resident of village-
Sikehari Chak, P.S.- Mokama, Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nityanand Neeraj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHAND
MALVIYA**

ORAL ORDER

3 23-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467
and 471 of the IPC and Section 138 of the NI Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, informant has
deposited 28,000 on 10.02.1995 and again Rs. 28,000/- on
28.02.1995 in the scheme i.e Child Welfare Scheme and it was
the 25% bonus per month, declared by the company, namely,
Helios Finance and Investment limited. It is further alleged that
on maturity, the company will have to pay 37,500/-. It is also
alleged that after maturity, the company has issued cheques of



Canara Bank *vide* Cheque no. 5872223 on 10.02.1999 and Cheque no. 5872225 dated 28.02.1999 of Rs. 37,500/- the complainant has deposited the said cheque on 16.04.1999 which was dishonored and the company has stopped the monthly payment of interest thereafter the complainant visited the company and asked for the payment of his amount but the company has not paid a single rupee to the complainant. Therefore, the complainant approached the Kotwali Police where no action has been taken against the accused persons and after that complainant filed a complaint petition before the Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. He next submits that petitioner was no where involved with respect to any of the allegations rather the company is also bonafidely ready to pay the claim and debt to the depositors for which a claim settlement office has been started and is duly functioning. Petitioner has got clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. On perusal of the first information report and impugned order dated 18.04.2026, it appears that two cheques



of Canara Bank *vide* Cheque no. 5872223 on 10.02.1999 and another Cheque no. 5872225 dated 20.08.1999 of Rs.37,500/- where dishonored and the company has stopped the monthly payment of interest and after exhausting all processes, the learned trial Court finally declared the petitioner absconder and issued warrant against him, so I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Ramesh Chand Malviya, J)

Brajesh Kumar/-

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

