

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16292 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4 Year-2019 Thana- E.C.I.R (GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL)
District- Patna

=====

Gita Devi Wife of Abhijeet Yadav @ Mahavir Yadav @ Banwari @ Gora
Resident of Vill.-Bandhudih, P.O.-Udaigarh, P.S.-Chhattarpur, Distt.-Palamu,
State-Jharkhand

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

Assistant Director, Director of Enforcement, Govt. of India Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anil Kumar Saxena, Adv.
For the State	:	Dr. Krishna Nandan Singh, ASG
For the ED		Mr. Manoj Kumar Singh, Adv.
		Mr. Ankit Kumar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

6 13-12-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offence punishable under Section 4 of PML Act.

3. It is alleged that co-accused Abhijeet Yadav is an
active member of banned outfit CPI (maoist), a left wing
extremist organization against whom there is allegation that as
area commander of Madhya zone of Bihar and Jharkhand he has
been alleged of threatening of innocent people and forcibly
collection of levy from various development works going in
Gaya, Aurangabad District of Bihar and Palamu District of
Jharkhand. It is further alleged that co-accused Abhijeet Yadav
acquired six properties in his name as well as in the name of his



wife Gita Devi (petitioner) through proceeds of crime as well as immovable properties acquired in the name of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that co-accused Abhijeet Yadav acquired six properties in his name and in the name of the petitioner is absolutely wrong as the aforesaid property has itself purchased by the petitioner by selling of agriculture products. He submits that the trial is going on, in which, out of 18 charge-sheet witnesses, 9 have been examined upto now. He submits that the petitioner is lady and there is no chance to tamper with the prosecution witness. He further submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para-3 of the bail application and she is languishing in judicial custody since 06.01.2024.

5. However, learned counsel for the E.D. opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the trial may be concluded within six months.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, her prayer for bail is rejected in connection with Special Trial No. (PMLA) 10 of 2020 arising out of ECIR No. PTZO/04/2019.



7. However, the trial court is directed to conclude
the trial within six months.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

devendra/-

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

