

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18213 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2020 Thana- IMAMGANJ District- Gaya

Geeta Das, D/O Ramsunder Ram R/V- Imamganj, P.S.- Imamganj, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Department of Vigilance, Bihar Patna through its Superintendent of Police.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vishwa Ranjan Choudhary
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Ajay Mishra
		Mr. Anil Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-07-2023 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Special P.P. for the Vigilance.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of her arrest in Imamganj P. S. Case No.171 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 420, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and the informant alleges that she secured appointment as Teacher based on forged certificate of Intermediate.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is



next submitted that the F.I.R. came to be instituted based on an inquiry conducted behind her back and no opportunity was given to her to explain her side of the case. It is further submitted that had an opportunity being given to the petitioner to explain her case, then perhaps the present F.I.R. would not have been instituted. It is further submitted that petitioner (Geeta Das) is daughter of Ramsunder Ram and in the F.I.R., the name of the accused person is Geeta Das, daughter of Bal Swaroop Chauhan.

5. The learned counsel thus submits that when petitioner is not the daughter of Bal Swaroop Chauhan and she had applied for her appointment as Teacher disclosing the name of her father as Ramsunder Das, then on what basis the police is knocking her door.

6. Learned Special P. P. for the Vigilance submits that in view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, there is absolutely no infirmity of the order passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Gaya, as such, the petitioner does not have any apprehension of arrest, until and unless her name figures subsequently during the course of investigation.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned Special P. P. for the Vigilance, the Court, for the present, is not



inclined to entertain the application and concurs with the reasons given by the learned Sessions Judge, Gaya for not entertaining the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

