

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 2262 of 2020

Saheb Kumar Bansphore Petitioner
Versus
1. The State of Jharkhand
3. Mahesh Paswan Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ranjeet Kr. Saw, Advocate
For the State : Mr. N.K. Ganju, A.P.P.

Order No. 03: Dated: 31st August, 2020

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the State.

So far as defect no. 9(ii) is concerned, learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the same once the situation normalizes. As regards the rest defects are concerned, the same are ignored.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with C.P. Case No. 331 of 2019, registered for the offences punishable under section 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been alleged that the complainant had given Rs. 3,00,000/- to the accused persons on their assurance that they will arrange for a job for the complainant in Food Corporation of India Ltd. Neither the job was made available nor was the money returned. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. It has been stated that the petitioner has invested in the property business on the allurement of the complainant and his two witnesses to the tune of Rs. 7,00,000/- and the cheques which were issued against the dues by the complainant and others were dishonoured. Learned counsel submits that only on account to get over the payment of dues to the petitioner, the present case has been instituted.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail made by the petitioner.

It appears from the impugned order that in order to substantiate the allegations made in the complaint petition photo copies of 11 admit cards

were submitted which would indicate the involvement of the petitioner. The issue of certain dues which the petitioner claims from the complainant is altogether a different subject matter.

In view of the nature of allegations in the complaint petition, which has been supported by the submission of documents as stated above, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

This application, accordingly, stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

MM