

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36209 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-107 Year-2020 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

DEEP SHIKHA SINGH (Female), aged about 30 years, D/O Rajesh Kumar
@ Rajesh Bhardwaj, Resident of village-Flat No.606, West Boring Canal
Road, Indraprasth Apartment, Buddha Colony, Patna.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anuj Kumar, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party : Mr. A.G.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 02-08-2021 Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to
remove the defects, as pointed out by the office, within a period
of four weeks from the date of restoration of normalcy.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State through Virtual mode.

The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in
connection with Sonepur P.S. Case No. 107 of 2020 for the
offence registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and
120(B) of the I.P.C.

The prosecution story, in brief, is that the
complainant-informant, namely, Bhawna Verma, State
Engagement Officer, N.S.D.C., Bihar, stated that under
N.S.D.C. including 'Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikash Yojna', in



short (P.M.K.V.Y.), the petitioner was provided Centre at Sonapur for implementing the project under the banner 'People Care Family' in short (P.C.F.). It has further been alleged that the informant received complaints that the candidates who had undergone completed and passed the training with P.C.F. have not been provided them certificate of training nor has taken steps for their placement. The matter was enquired and it was found that the petitioner has sublet the 'P.M.K.V.Y.' training to other persons which is against the guidelines of 'P.M.K.V.Y.' and also found that several Aadhar Cards and duplicate candidates were involved by P.C.F. On several calls regarding the same, the petitioner did not respond.

It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. There is no allegation of tampering with the witnesses alleged against the petitioner. The allegations are in three folds:- First is that the persons who took the training have not been given certificates in respect of that training. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the certificates of the training were already uploaded on the Internet. Second is that efforts were not being made on the part of the petitioner for getting placement for the trained persons. The said allegation is



also denied by the petitioner. It is a continuous process by which the scheme is being carried out by the concerned N.G.O. for getting the placement of the trained candidates and many of such trained persons have already got placement at different places. Third is that the petitioner had given a sub contract work to another agency. There is no such document on record to show that any sub contract was made on the part of the petitioner. The petitioner denies the said allegation. There is no allegation of misappropriation of public money under the scheme by the petitioner or its N.G.O. The petitioner is a lady and she is suffering from medical problems. She has been made accused in the present case for political reasons.

On behalf of the learned counsel for the State, it has been submitted that the petitioner is named in the F.I.R.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner above named, in the event of arrest or surrender before the learned court below within a period of twelve weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on her personal bond to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge-IX, Saran at Chapra, in connection with Sonapur P. S. Case No. 107 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.



Once the normalcy is restored, the petitioner shall furnish bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) only with two sureties of the like amount each within a period of eight weeks to the satisfaction of the court concerned in connection with the aforesaid case.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

