

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49113 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-993 Year-2023 Thana- ARA NAGAR District- Bhojpur

Rajnil Kamal Son Of Ramchela Paswan R/O- Village- Sondihra, P.S.-
Shivsagar, Distt.- Rohtas, Pin-821111

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Navin Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-11-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

02. In the present case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Ara Town P.S. Case No. 993 of 2023 registered for the alleged offences under Section 419 & 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

03. As per prosecution case, the petitioner was a candidate in B.P.S.C Examination, 2023 and when the biometric match of finger did not tally with the petitioner, the co-accused Vijay Kumar appearing in the name of the petitioner was apprehended.

04. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner did not appear in the examination and he is not



aware about the person who appeared in his place. There is general and vague allegations and there is no material to show culpability of the petitioner in the alleged offence. All the offences mentioned in the FIR are bailable in nature except Section 420 of the Indian Penal code but the same is not made out in the present facts and circumstances. The co-accused Vijay Kumar has been enlarged on bail by the learned Sub-ordinate Court. The petitioner is having no criminal antecedent.

05. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the submission made on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned A.P.P. submits that the co-accused was apprehended while trying to write exam on behalf of the petitioner and the petitioner's offence is very serious because he would have been the direct beneficiary.

06. In view of the seriousness of allegation, I do not think it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. Hence, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

anuradha/-

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

