

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35948 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2017 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

MD. SARFARAJUDDIN S/o Md. Nawazuddin R/o Vikramshila Nagar, P.S.-
Kahalgaon, Distt.-Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR THROUGH THE CBI / AC-2, NEW DELHI

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sumeet Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bipin Kumar Sinha, Advocate for CBI

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL ORDER

5 26-03-2021 Heard Mr. Sumit Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Bipin Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for
the CBI.

The petitioner is in custody in connection with Special
Case No. 3 of 2019 corresponding to R.C. No. 18(A)/2017
arising out of Bhagalpur Kotwali (Tilkamanjhi) P.S. Case No.
514 of 2017 for the offences under Section 120(B) read with
Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and Section 13(2) read
with Section 13(1)(i)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act,
1988.

A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the
CBI. The IO of the present case is also present in Court.

From the materials available on the record, it appears
that the petitioner has played key role in the fraudulent



withdrawal. He was holding the post of Senior Manager, Bank of Baroda. In fact, in the Srijan Scam the bank has played key role. A Co-ordinate Benche of this Court has occasion to consider similar application of bail of Bank officials and the Court declined to grant privilege of bail to the Bank officials for their involvement and role played in the scam. The case of the petitioner, in no way, different from the case of the other bank officials, whose bail has been rejected.

Mr. Sumit Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on Annexure-2 to submit that as per the banking norms, the petitioner cannot be fastened with any accountability.

The Court does not find any substance in such argument. The argument is noted to be rejected only.

In view of the above, the Court is not inclined to grant privilege of bail to the petitioner. The prayer is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

spandey/-

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

