

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30479 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-3 Year-2020 Thana- GURUA District- Gaya

RAVINDRA RAVIDAS S/o Ramdash Ravidas @ Ram Das Ram Teacher in Primary School, Nariyahi in P.S.-Gurua, District-Gaya, Resident of Village-Nadaura, P.S.-Gurua, District-Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar, Patna, through its Deputy Superintendent of Police, Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Arvind Kumar Singh
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arbind Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-12-2020 Heard both sides.

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Gurua P.S. case No. 03/2020 registered under Section 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the IPC.

The informant is the Inspector of Vigilance Department who was entrusted to examine and verify the certificates of Panchayat Teachers, namely, Sweta Kumari, Chinta Devi, Rupa Kumari and Ravindra Ravidas, the petitioner. The petitioner was having B.E.T.E.T. roll No. 1140110200. The result of the petitioner was verified from the Bihar School Examination Board (BSEB) and it was found that petitioner submitted fake certificate said to have been issued by the BSEB. In fact the petitioner has failed in the B.E.T.E.T. examination but he submitted the certificate of getting 93 marks whereas the petitioner got only 51 marks and was not qualified.



The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner did not get any opportunity to give his show cause. The petitioner was appointed after due verification on the post of Panchayat Teacher but it appears that writ petition was filed in this court and this court directed the Vigilance department to make enquiry with regard to appointment of teachers on fake certificates and in pursuance thereof enquiry was held by the Vigilance department. The informant, Inspector of Vigilance department, verified the B.E.T.E.T. certificate of the petitioner and it was found that petitioner at the time of his appointment submitted forged certificate of B.E.T.E.T. said to have been issued by the BSEB who later on disclosed that petitioner was not qualified and he got only 51 marks but the petitioner submitted forged certificate showing that he got 93 marks.

Taking into consideration the facts aforesaid, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Jha, J)

BKS/-

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

