

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14537 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-263 Year-2023 Thana- SUPPI District- Sitamarhi

Ritesh Ranjan @ Nitesh Ranjan Son of Shri Jagdeo Ram R/o- Village-
Bhavadepur Got, P.S.- Riga, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Prabhakar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Harendra Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-06-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471/34 of the IPC in connection with Suppi P.S. Case No.263 of 2023.

3. The learned counsel submits that petitioner has antecedent of two cases and has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant with an allegation that during inquiry it transpired that an amount of Rs.17,56,574/- from the S.N.A. Accounts of 29 Schools have been siphoned of by the accused persons including the petitioner which was meant for providing Mid Day Meals in the school and the petitioner was working as Mid Day Meals Sadhan Sevi at Suppi Block and Subhash Kumar used to supply the maternal of Mid Day Meal



to the school.

4. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is next submitted that under the Mid Day Meal Programme the vendor supplies the maternal to the school based on which the headmaster of the school raises the bill and after the bill is raised the same is approved by the petitioner and after approval of the petitioner the bill is sent to the concerned Bank and the concerned Bank thereafter makes the payment to the vendor after matching the specimen signature.

5. It is thus submitted that since the bills were raised by the headmaster of the school and the petitioner only approved the bills, as such it cannot be alleged that petitioner was instrumental in misappropriating public money.

6. The learned APP, Mr. Rabindra Kumar opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that it is a racket which is rampant and the persons associated with the scheme are minting money. It is submitted that it appears that the petitioner without verifying the bill will approve the bill. It is also submitted that had the petitioner before approving the bill verified whether the school in question received the materials from the vendor or not, in that event the fact would have come



to the fore that forged bills are being issued by the headmasters, but then the same was not done which amply demonstrates the connivance of the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to accept the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

