

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64140 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-112 Year-2018 Thana- GOH District- Aurangabad

Nawal Kishore Prasad Gupta, S/o Late Ramrup Pd. Gupta, R/o village- Ram  
Nagar, Jehanabad, P.S. and District- Jehanabad ... .. Petitioner  
Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Regional Officer, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Regional Office,  
Aurangabad.

... .. Opposite Parties

**Appearance :**

|                    |   |                                     |
|--------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner | : | Mr. Samir Kumar, Advocate           |
| For the State      | : | Mr. Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam, APP |
| For the Bank       | : | Mr. Dr. Anand Kumar, Advocate       |
|                    |   | Mr. Ramesh Gupta, Advocate          |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      06-10-2023                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP  
for the State and learned counsel for the Madhya Bihar Gramin  
Bank (hereinafter referred to as the 'Bank').

2. This application has been filed renewing the prayer  
for pre-arrest bail of the petitioner in connection with Goh P.S.  
Case No. 112 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable  
under Sections 406, 409 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code. The  
petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

3. Earlier, this Court had considered the case of the  
petitioner and upon taking note of the seriousness of the  
allegations against him, vide its order dated 09.01.2019 passed  
in Cr. Misc. no. 48831 of 2018 refused to grant privilege of pre-  
arrest bail to the petitioner.



4. The operative part of the order dated 09.01.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. no. 48831 of 2018 reads as under:-

“In the given facts and circumstances of the case, on going through the report of the Enquiry Officer-cum-Chief Manager of the Aurangabad Branch, this Court finds that the name of this petitioner has transpired at various places in the report showing that the withdrawal slips were verified through his user and the main user system of this petitioner was involved in the verification work and the cheques were also found with the signature of this petitioner, this Court is, thus, not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. In case the petitioner surrender in the Court below within a period of four weeks from today and prays for regular bail, his prayer shall be considered without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.”

5. Mr. Sameer Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner though attempted to take a plea that the repeated anticipatory bail application has been filed on some fresh ground but he is unable to demonstrate even a single ground which would permit him to renew his prayer for anticipatory bail.

6. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the Bank are present.

7. In the circumstances, this Court finds no merit in this application. This application stands dismissed accordingly.

**(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)**

lekhi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

