

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82915 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-599 Year-2023 Thana- RAJGIR District- Nalanda

Rinku Kumari W/O Awshesh Kumar Singh R/O Village- Chakpar, P.S- Rajgir,  
Distt.- Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Department of Vigilance through Director General, Bihar, Patna. Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                                               |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr.Harsh Singh, Advocate                                      |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr.Ajay Mishra, APP                                           |
| For the Vigilance        | : | Mr. Arvind Kumar, Spl. P.P.<br>Mr. Paritosh Parimal, Advocate |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR PANDEY**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      12-12-2024                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the Vigilance.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending her arrest in connection with Rajgir P.S. Case no. 599 of 2023 instituted for the offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was a contract Teacher and it is alleged that she has obtained the appointment on the basis of forged mark sheet issued by P.S.T.E, Assam (Guwahati). It is also mentioned in the FIR that this petitioner has not resigned during the amnesty period provided



by the Hon'ble Court.

4. During the course of argument, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has filed an R.T.I. before the P.S.T.E., Assam from where it has been informed that the document of the year 1998 pertaining to AU No. 060 is correct. It is also noted in the R.T.I. that the earlier letter was wrongly issued.

5. Learned counsel for the Vigilance vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that since the petitioner has not resigned during the period of amnesty, she does not deserve bail.

6. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner has shown the orders of the co-ordinate Bench where the petitioners were being terminated have been granted anticipatory bail. He has categorically stated in his petition that she has been terminated.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and in the facts and circumstances of the case as stated above, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below within a period of four weeks from today and in the event of her arrest or surrender in connection with Rajgir P.S. Case no. 599 of 2023, he will be



enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Biharsharif, Nalanda subject to the conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

**(Ashok Kumar Pandey, J)**

Jagdish/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

