

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2455 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-6 Year-2018 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

Seema Kumari W/o Late Pranay Kumar Resident of Village - Pranwati lane,
Barahopora, P.s.- Ishak Chak, Distt.- Bhagalpur, Presently Residing at Nahru
Nagar, P.s.- Patliputra, Distt.- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The Central Bureau of Investigation, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. S.D. Sanjay, Sr. Advocate
	:	Mr. Mohit Agrawal, Advocate
	:	Ms. Priya Gupta, Advocate
	:	Mr. Lokesh, Advocate
	:	Ms. Ananya, Advocate
For the C.B.I.	:	Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar, Sr. Advocate
	:	Ms. Nirmala Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 11-07-2022 Heard learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of
the petitioner and learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of
C.B.I.

Let the defect(s), if any, be removed within a period
of four weeks from today.

The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Special
Case No. 11 of 2020 arising out of R.C. No. 6(A) of 2018 dated
12.06.2018, registered for the offence under Sections 34,
120(B), 409, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of Indian Penal Code
(arising out of Sabour P.S. Case No. 241 of 2017 dated
23.08.2017 registered under Section 120(B), 409, 420, 468 and
471 of Indian Penal Code), pending in Court of learned Special



Judge, CBI-II, Patna.

The accused/petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and is in custody since 26.08.2021.

The fact as set out in the F.I.R., alleges that the office bearers including the petitioner herein, created forged record and minutes of the meeting of Shrijan Mahila Vikas Sahyog Samiti Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as 'SMVSSL') and used the same as genuine for opening of the bank accounts, by concealing the facts, from appropriate authority, committing thereby criminal breach of trust, being a public servant and also committed cheating and dishonesty inducing delivery of property.

Learned senior counsel, Mr. S.D. Sanjay appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that petitioner is an innocent widow lady and has been falsely implicated in this case. In support of submission of false implication, it is submitted that for the only reason, as petitioner is the widow daughter-in-law of the co-accused, namely, Smt Manorma Devi, who was the authorized signatory of bank accounts of SMVSSL, named in the present case. It is further submitted that, during the course of investigation, it is surfaced that Smt Sarita Jha became the authorized signatory of bank after the death of Smt Manorma



Devi. Petitioner was the only elected member of SMVSSL, where allegation is limited only to sign in the general meeting register. It is submitted that main accused namely, Sarita Jha has already been granted bail by one of the learned Co-ordinate Bench of this Court through Cr. Misc. No. 51547 of 2021 dated 28.04.2022. It is further submitted that investigation in this case is complete for which chargesheet has been submitted, as such, there is no chance of tapering with evidence. While concluding the argument, it is submitted that by taking note of all allegations in totality, in the background of legal proposition as laid by Hon'ble Supreme Court, while deciding the matter in ***Nimmagadda Prasad Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in (2013) 7 SCC 466***, this is a fit case to grant bail to the petitioner, where paragraph no. 24 of the judgement, observed as:

“24. While granting bail, the Court has to keep in mind the nature of accusations, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused,



reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail, the legislature has used the words “reasonable grounds for believing” instead of “the evidence” which means the Court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy itself as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt.”

A counter affidavit, in the present bail petition was filed by C.B.I. on 21.06.2022.

Learned senior counsel, Mrs. Nivedita Nirvikar appearing on behalf of the C.B.I. opposes the prayer of bail and



submitted that the present case is a big scam dealing with the public money. It is submitted that large public money was misappropriated by the petitioner in collusion with other co-accused, but fairly conceded that number of accused persons have already been granted bail by this Court and also in agreement that co-accused, namely, Sarita Jha, having more serious allegations, has already been granted bail by one of the learned Co-ordinate Bench of this Court through Cr. Misc. No. 51547 of 2021 dated 28.04.2022.

Considering the facts and circumstances as mentioned above, as allegation against this petitioner, who is a lady, is very much general and omnibus and that too limited to sign only minute of the meeting being an executive member of SMVSSL, having no role attributed to control the affairs of the Samiti coupled with the fact that chargeheet has already been submitted, let the petitioner, above named, is directed to be released on bail in connection with Special Case No. 11 of 2020 arising out of R.C. No. 6(A) of 2018 (arising out of Sabour P.S. Case No. 241 of 2017) on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Judge, CBI-II, Patna, subject to the following conditions:



“(i) Accused/Petitioner shall cooperate in the trial and shall be physically present on each and every date before the Trial Court till conclusion of the trial and exemption from physical appearance be allowed by the Trial Court, only on medical ground of the petitioner, duly supported by the documents.

(ii) That one of the bailors shall be the close family member of the petitioner.”

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Ankit/-

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

