
(2021) 08 JH CK 0035
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : A.B.A. No. 5482 Of 2021

Roop Kamal Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 16-08-2021

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 34, 406, 419, 420

Citation : (2021) 08 JH CK 0035

Hon'ble Judges : Anil Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Dilip Kr. Chakraverty, Vandana Bharti

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Anil Kumar Choudhary, J

Apprehending his arrest in connection with Balidih P.S. Case No. 52 of 2021 instituted under Sections 419, 420 and 406/34 of the Indian Penal Code,

the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner while working as Account Manager

in M/s Patil Rail Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Bokaro along with the co-accused persons had the responsibility of cash of Rs.7,08,724/- of the said

company but is not giving the account of the said amount and alleged to have cheated and committed criminal breach of trust in respect of the said

amount. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been removed from the said

company and only thereafter this F.I.R. has been lodged. It is further submitted that two different persons were the authorized signatory for

withdrawal of amount of M/s Patil Rail Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Bokaro and from its concerned bank account, the cheques of the said company

cannot be used without the signature of the said persons. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the

investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl.P.P appearing for the State on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that

there is specific allegation of committing criminal breach of trust and cheating huge amount of money, hence, the custodial interrogation of the

petitioner is required during the investigation for recovery of the cheated amount. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the

privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of the allegation against the petitioner and the requirement of his custodial interrogation during the investigation of the

case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the petitioner be given privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer

for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.