

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.23059 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1 Year-2021 Thana- ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR
District- Patna

=====

Nand Kishore Das Son Of Late Lalchand Das @ Late Lal Chandra Das
Resident Of Village - Husena Chakphatulah, P.S. - Goraul, District - Vaishali
And Presently Suspended Branch Manager, Branch Office - Mehsaul, Central
Bank Of India (CBI), Attached With Regional Office - Central Bank Of India,
Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Regional Manager, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Motihari Bihar
3. Economic Offence Unit (EOU), Patna. Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Suresh Mishra, Adv
For the O.P. No. 3	:	Mr. Vishwanath Pd Sinha, Sr. Adv

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL KUMAR PANWAR
ORAL ORDER

2 19-04-2023 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The present petition has been filed for grant of

bail to the petitioner which was earlier rejected vide

orders dated 31.01.2023 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 44202

of 2022.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the

petitioner that petitioner had started his career as casual

employee for cleaning work at the bank but later on his

services were regularized in Grade-IV employee and due



to his dedication, honesty and clean image, he was promoted time and again and was serving as Scale-II Manager in Dalpat Bishunpur Branch at the relevant time. The petitioner had little knowledge of computer and taking advantage of petitioner's little knowledge of computer, co-accused Utpal Anand applied his shrewd mind in grabbing the huge amount of bank money by fraudulent transactions even in the short absence of this petitioner from the bank.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the opposite parties that huge public money was embezzled and transferred to the account of co-accused Utpal Anand and the said fraudulent transactions were made by using the user code of the petitioner who was Branch Manager of the bank at the relevant time.

Considering the fact that prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 31.01.2023 after considering the direct involvement of the petitioner since he was Branch Manager of the concerned bank at



the relevant time and learned counsel for the petitioner has not brought on record any new ground to take a different view in the matter, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of bail to the petitioner.

The prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner stands rejected.

The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same at the earliest.

(Sunil Kumar Panwar, J)

Shageer/-

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

