

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14348 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-224 Year-2021 Thana- DHAMDAHA District- Purnia

MEERA DEVI Daughter of Raghunath Mahto Resident of Village- Laxmipur,
Post- Bardela, P.S.- Damdaha, District- Purnea, posted Primary Vidyal
Laxmipur, Bardela, Panchayat Bardela, Prakhand- Dhamdaha, District-
Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP

Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, Spl.P.P. Vigilance

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

3 20-09-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
Spl.P.P. appearing for the Vigilance and learned APP for the
State.

The petitioner apprehends her arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468,
471, 420 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and
the informant alleges that on verification it was found that the
marksheet of the petitioner which she had submitted for being
appointed as Panchayat Teacher was found fake, it is also
alleged that the petitioner, during the amnesty period, did not



submit her resignation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, it is next submitted that the petitioner seriously disputes and contests the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it is next submitted that the FIR itself does not with clarity alleges the allegations, as it has been alleged that the intermediate marksheet of the petitioner is fake and then it also records that petitioner was absent which *prima-facie* appears to be dichotomic.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that since the petitioner was aware that her marksheet based on which she was appointed was genuine hence she did not resign during the period of amnesty as granted by this Court, the learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that before instituting the present FIR, the petitioner was not given any opportunity to rebut the submissions as alleged in the FIR.

Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned Spl.P.P. for the Vigilance oppose the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, but are not able to meet the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that no opportunity was given to the petitioner prior to instituting the FIR to put forth her defence/case.



Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Dhamdaha P.S. Case No. 224 of 2021 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Shivam/-

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

