

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2609 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1 Year-2016 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Manju Singh wife of Kameshwar Prasad Singh @ K.P. Singh, Resident of Village- Kohargarh, P.S.- Ekma, District- Saran, presently residing at Road No. 14, Rajeev Nagar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Superintendent Of Police, Special Vigilance Unit, Bihar, Patna and Ors
2. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Mauryalok Complex Branch, Patna.
3. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Patliputra Branch, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Prashant Sinha, Adv. Ms. Priya, Adv.
For the Vigilance	:	Mr.Avnish Kumar, AC to Arvind Kumar
For the Bank	:	Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

7 25-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Avnish Kumar, learned AC to Arvind Kumar, learned counsel for the Vigilance and Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, learned counsel for the Bank.

Petitioner in this case is aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the order dated 21.06.2017 passed by the learned Special Judge, Vigilance-1st, Patna in Special Case No.40 of 2016 on an application under Section 451 Cr.P.C. By the impugned order, the learned Special Judge has directed for defreezing/release of the three accounts in favour of



Kameshwar Prasad Singh and his wife Manju Singh (petitioner) respectively with a condition to maintain the minimum balance in the three accounts as on 03.08.2016.

This writ application has been filed only on behalf of Smt. Manju Singh challenging the order dated 21.06.2017. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that so far as Kameshwar Prasad Singh is concerned, he has not challenged this order.

In course of hearing, when this Court called upon learned counsel for the petitioner to say as to what are the illegalities and infirmities in the impugned order, learned counsel tried to impress upon this Court that very freezing of the account by the I.O. was illegal and without compliance with the provisions of Section 102 Cr.P.C. So far as the impugned order is concerned, no illegality has been pointed out to this Court.

A perusal of the writ application and the reliefs prayed would show that in this case there is no challenge to the freezing of the account by the I.O. At this stage, it is also informed that the investigation of the case is complete, a charge-sheet has already been filed and the order taking cognizance has been passed, therefore a prima-facie case has



been found against the petitioner.

In the given facts and circumstances, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

This writ application has no merit. It is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/-

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

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

