

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1148 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-245 Year-2016 Thana- GRIYAK District- Nalanda

PURUSHOTTAM GIRI S/o Late Balram Giri Resident of Village- Meharpar
(Bank Colony), P.S.- Laheri, District- Naldan.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satya Prakash

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Nath Jha

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

2 03-08-2022 The learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to

remove all the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within

one month.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

APP for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences

alleged under Sections 406, 420 and 409 of the Indian Penal

Code and Section 66 of the I.T. Act, registered in connection

with Giriyak P.S.Case No. 245 of 2016.

The informant is the Branch Manager of Madhya

Bihar Gramin Bank, Pawapuri Branch, Nalanda. As per

allegation, a fake saving bank account bearing No.

74101700027054 was opened in the name of one Sanjay



Kumar in his Branch on 11.10.2012. The interest per annum was given 404% in place of 4%. The identifiers of that account were also forged persons. From the said account, Rs. 40,00,000/- was transferred in a fake bank account bearing saving bank account No. 71910100047055 which was opened in Rambhawan Branch by impersonation and producing fake documents in the name of one Khushbhu Kumari. A number of transactions were made in the account mentioned above.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner Purshottam Giri is suspended Bank Manager of Rambhawan Branch in which the fake account of Khushbu Kumari was opened. He has submitted further that the computer operator Ashish Priyadarshi has been granted anticipatory bail in Cr.Misc. No. 39297 of 2017 (Annexure-2).

It was mentioned in that order that co-accused Ashish Priyadarshi was a computer operator and his function was to make entry in the computer after permission is granted to open the account in the Bank. The work of that petitioner was clerical in nature. The petitioner is the person who was authorized to permit the opening the account and in his regime and under his order the fake account was opened and fake transactions were made. He does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. His



prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Office shall ensure that all defects are removed by the petitioner within the stipulated time as provided hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

HR/-

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

