

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61311 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-32 Year-2021 Thana- AGRER District- Rohtas

1. SHARDA DEVI Wife of Santosh Kumar Roy Resident of Village - Gotpa,
P.S.- Agrer, District - Rohtas
2. Sushila Devi Wife of Binod Chandrabanshi Resident of Village - Gotpa,
P.S.- Agrer, District - Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raghunandan Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Umeshanand Pandit

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 11-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the

State.

Petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered
for the offence punishable under Section 406, 420 of the Indian
Penal Code.

As per the prosecution case, Rs. 11, 90, 800/- was
allotted to ward No.4 of Mahaddiganj, Gram Panchayat under
Mukhyamantri Gramin Peyajal Nischya Yojna and the money
was withdrawn but work was done only worth Rs. 92,309/- and
rest of the amount was misappropriated.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits
that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in
the case. It is further submitted that petitioner No.1 is president
of Ward Kriyanavayan Awam Prabandhan Samiti, Gram



Panchayat, Mahadiganj, Ward No.4 and petitioner No.2 is Secretary and work was to be executed by Manish Sinha and petitioners have nowhere involved in execution of the work. It is next submitted that on 31.05.2019 petitioners made a complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Rohtas District Magistrate, DY S.P., Inspector for lodging the FIR against the Mukhiya, Pratima Devi, Gramsevak Arvind Singh and their associates, Manish Sinha and Sunil Singh but these authorities did not take any action on the application and thereafter the informant lodged this case with sole intention to save his skin.

Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that in spite of withdrawal of money work was not completed and the amount was misappropriated by the petitioners and other accused persons.

Considering the nature of accusation and gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the same is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

BKS/-

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

