



Bhushan Rai, who has been granted anticipatory bail by the Court below. He, therefore, submits that the petitioner also deserves anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that since the petitioner has not taken any amount, she is entitled for grant of bail. It is further submitted that she being the wife of the co-accused is not involved in the crime.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the complainant oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that both the husband and wife have cheated the complainant and in the court below a defence was taken by the husband that he has not signed the agreement, therefore, he was granted anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the complainant further submits that petitioner has suppressed the annexures of the complaint petition and has not annexed the same with the complaint.

6. Considering the gravity of the offence and the allegation that petitioner and her husband have cheated the complainant of Rs. 14,60,000/- (Fourteen Lakh and Sixty Thousand), this Court is not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.



7. The application for anticipatory bail is, accordingly, rejected.

8. The petitioners are directed to surrender in the court below within a period of two weeks from today and seek regular bail, if so advised, failing which the Superintendent of Police, Patna will take all steps for the arrest of the petitioners.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Superintendent of Police, Patna through FAX for its compliance forthwith.

**(Sandeep Kumar, J)**

vashudha/-

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

