

In the Court of 1st Addl. Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra.
A.B.P. no. 747/2025 (C. no. 47/2014 Tr. no. 1760/2025)
Munna Kumar Yadav versus State of Bihar.
O R D E R

16.3.2026

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Addl. P.P. for the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioner namely Munna Kumar Yadav who is apprehending his arrest in the above referred case registered u/s 420, 467, 468 of I.P.C.

Brief case of prosecution is that Manjay Chaudhary is the complainant of this case while the petitioner and others who are alleged to be authorised authority/agent of a non-banking and on their convincing and assurance, the complainant has deposited Rs. 5000/- in fixed deposit in non banking of the petitioner, but when the complainant wanted to withdraw his money, the petitioner failed to do so and abused and assaulted the complainant.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner he is innocent and he has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in this case due to suspicion, he is not the member of the business service center, no any regular or anticipatory bail petition has been filed by the petitioner in any court of law, he is not named accused in any other criminal case as well, and he is ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposed the prayer for bail.

Perused the record and on perusal of the same, it is found that the petitioner is named in the complaint petition that he being authorized authority of a non-banking taken Rs. 5000/- from complainant on the ground that the money will be fixed but later on money was not returned to complainant. It appears that after inquiry, and on the basis of evidence witness examined in the inquiry, the learned court below has taken cognizance against the petitioner and other accused persons of this case u/s 420, 467, 468 of I.P.C. Earlier anticipatory bail petition of co-accused of this case namely Arun Kumar Yadav has been rejected by this court on 8.6.2018 vide ABP No. 1600/2018 and the case of this petitioner is on same footing.

Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and also for the reasons discussed above, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dictated)

1st Addl. Sessions Judge, Saran.