

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60941 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-384 Year-2022 Thana- RUPAULI District- Purnia

Zafar Jahan, Daughter Of Late Quamruzzaman Village- Harnath, Samstipur,
Ps- Shahkund, Dist- Bhagalpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Upendra Kumar son of Sri Nageshwar Prasad village- Paharpur, Ps-
Kauacol, Dist- Nawada

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Md. Najmul Hodda- Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ajay Mishra- A.P.P.
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar- Law Officer, Vigilance Mr. Paritosh Parimal- Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-10-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the
learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Vigilance and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of her
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal
Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that petitioner based on forged mark-sheet of
BETET secured appointment as a Teacher.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that no show-cause was issued to the petitioner prior to instituting the FIR. It is next submitted that had an opportunity been given to the petitioner to explain her side of the case, perhaps the instant FIR would not have been instituted. It is next submitted that service of the petitioner was terminated by an order dated 19.02.2018 (Annexure-2) whereas the verification report of the B.S.E.B. was issued on 22.06.2021, as such, the order of termination preceded the issuance of verification report by B.S.E.B. It is also submitted that in the FIR, it is alleged that the petitioner secured appointment as Teacher based on certificate of Md. Mustakim Alam. It is next submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove her innocence.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that

6. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail



on her furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Purnea in connection with C.I.S. No.666 of 2024 arising out of Rupauli P. S. Case No.384 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

8. The application stands allowed.

9. However, it is made clear that in the event, if any application is filed by the Investigating Officer before the learned trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner, despite giving assurance to this Court, is not cooperating in the investigation or is not presenting himself as and when required, the learned trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner after recording reasons.

10. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned Police Station through the learned trial Court.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

