

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46909 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-656 Year-2003 Thana- COMPLAINT CASE District- Supaul

PUNAM JHA@PUNAM DEVI, Wife of Rudra Nand Jha @ Buchhu Jha
Resident of Village - Balua Bazar, P.S.- Balua, Dist.- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Abdul Hamid, Son of late Israt Ali Member Panchayat Samitee Chhatapur,
Resident of Village - Kathara, P.S.- Chhatapur, Dist.- Supaul.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pramod Mishra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Kalyan Shankar

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJENDRA KUMAR
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 30-07-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Complaint Case No. 656 of 2003, registered under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

The accusation is that on the proposal of 1/3rd members of the Prakhand Panchyat Samiti, Sunil Kumar, B.D.O, Chhatapur issued notice for the No-Confidence-Motion against Deo Nandan Yadav, Pramukh and Punam Jha, Up-Pramukh to be held on 31.07.2003. On 31.07.2003, while the members of the Prakhand Panchayat Samiti took their chair to



convene the meeting, in the meantime, they were informed that on 30.07.2003, a subsequent notice had been issued by Sunil Kumar for adjournment of the said meeting, on the basis of Certificate of Sri Jitendra Kumar Saha, Advocate, Patna High Court, Patna in which it was detailed that C.W.J.C. No. 8031 of 2003 is preferred by the Deo Nandan Yadav (Pramukh), if the special meeting for No-Confidence-Motion convene then it will be contemptuous. When matter was verified from the Hon'ble High Court then it came to light that said case was not filed by Pramukh, rather the same was filed by one Indra Deo Lal. As such, Deo Nandan Yadav (Pramukh) and petitioner being the Up-Pramukh committed forgery in connivance with Sunil Kumar, BDO.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it would appear from the F.I.R. that petitioner, who is lady was Up-Pramukh at that time and the certificate of Advocate was filed by Deo Nandan Yadav not by this petitioner. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, let the above named petitioner, be released on bail, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail



bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Supaul in connection with Complaint Case No. 656 of 2003, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Rajendra Kumar Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

