

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24416 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-277 Year-2019 Thana- RAJPUR District- Buxar

MEENA KUMARI W/o of Jai Prakash Singh Resident of Village- Devadhiya, P.S.- Rajpur, District- Buxar. Then Panchayat Sikshika appointment Urdu Primary School, Jamauli, Panchayat- Devadhiya, Block- Rajpur, Police Station- Rajapur, District- Buxar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR
2. Police Superintendent of Police, Nigrani Anveshan Bureau, Patna. Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nachiketa Jha, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 06-10-2020 Heard Mr. Nachiketa Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Pawan Kumar Chaurasia, Additional Public Prosecutor for the state through video conferencing.

2. Petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection with Rajpur PS Case No. 277 of 2019 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 120(B) and 471 IPC.

3. The allegation against the petitioner as per, First Information Report, is that she submitted forged and fabricated certificate at the time of her appointment as *Panchayat Shikshak* and the present case has been lodged in light of the order passed by Patna High Court in a Public Interest Litigation arising out of



CWJC No. 15459/2014 and during course of investigation, the certificates, submitted by the petitioners, were found to be forged and fabricated.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case with oblique motive. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is a lady and the present FIR has been lodged without any proper verification. Learned counsel also submits that after proper verification of the certificates, the petitioner was appointment as *Panchayat Shikshak*.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further relies upon certain orders passed in Cr. Misc. Nos. 54184/2019 and 57857/2018, in which, the persons having similar allegations were granted anticipatory bail by this Court.

6. Learned counsel also submits that petitioner has already been terminated from her service and she deserves anticipatory bail.

7. Having regard to the submissions made by the parties and taking into consideration the material on record and the fact that the present case has been lodged on the basis of direction issued by the Patna High Court in PIL vide CWJC No. 15459/2014, I am not inclined to exercise my discretion for



grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is,
accordingly, rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

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

