

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46681 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-225 Year-2023 Thana- NAUTAN District- Siwan

=====

Dharmendra Kumar Singh S/o Late Ramashankar Singh @ Late
Ramashanker Singh R/o vill - Lohgajar, P.S. - Asaw, Distt. - Siwan, Presently
Residing at vill - Mairwa Dham, P.S. - Mairwa, Distt. - Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Regional Manager, Uttar Bihar Gramin Bank, Regional Office, Siwan
Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bindhyachal Singh, Sr. Adv. Mr. Ram Binod Singh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, APP
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Prabhakar Jha, Adv. Mr. Amitesh Jha, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 02-12-2024 Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner,

learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the opposite

party no. 2.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in Nautan P.S.

Case No. 225 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable

under Sections 406, 409, 420, 467, 468/34 of the Indian Penal

Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner along

with other co-accused persons are said to have committed fraud

of Rs.11 lakh by opening various savings accounts, term

deposits, other accounts and issuing fake deposit certificates.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits



that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The allegation levelled against the petitioner is not specific rather general and omnibus in nature. He submits that in terms of Clause 7 (xii) of the Uttar Bihar Gramin Bank Accountability Policy, the accountability of an employee is *“No accountability will be fixed for any lapse, which has not been pointed out in the two successive audit reports or four years from the date of the event (i.e. occurrence of lapse) whichever is later”*. He further submits that the departmental proceeding is still going on. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-3 of this application.

5. Learned APP for the State as well as learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the investigation is still going on.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of case and the nature of offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

anand/-

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

