

AB 1531/2017
BEFORE

HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE RUMI KUMARI PHUKAN

Heard Mr. J.Roy, learned counsel for the accused petitioner and Mr.K.Konwar, learned Addl.P.P.Assam.

By filing this 3rd anticipatory bail application under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner has prayed for anticipatory bail in connection with Lumding P.S.Case No.95/2015 registered under Section 294/406/506/420/120(B)/34 IPC.

By referring to the document that has been annexed that it has been contended that the money has been collected from the customer have already been deposited to the company way back in the year 2011-2012 and as such the petitioner is not in any way involved as regards the mis-appropriate of collected money.

This Court on earlier two occasions gone through the case diary which indicates sufficient complicity of the accused petitioner irrespective of the status of the petitioner that has been pleaded in the petition. On the other hand, referred amount was received far back in the year 2011-2012 whereas it is an admitted position that investors money were not returned even after maturity period.

I find no any new ground to go for the case diary, as prayed for by the petitioner, in view of apparent complicity that has been made out against the petitioner. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.