

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81457 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-645 Year-2018 Thana- LAKHISARAI District- Lakhisarai

Amarjeet Kumar S/O Ram Sudama Chaudhary Resiedent of Village and P.O-
Telhara, P.S-Ekangar Sarai, Dist.-Nalanda, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arun Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Mushtaque Alam

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 11-12-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.
2. This application, for grant of anticipatory bail,
arises out of Lakhisarai Police Station Case No. 645 of 2018,
disclosing offences under Sections 420, 406 of the Indian Penal
Code.
3. As per the prosecution story, a sum of Rs.
2,75,000/- was fraudulently withdrawn from the bank account
of the Bihar Regional Gramin Bank, Pachna Road Branch,
Lakhisarai, of the informant's father.
4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is the Office Assistant posted in the branch and is not
named in the FIR and has been made accused at the behest of
the Branch Manager who is the FIR named accused person. A
sum of Rs. 2,75,000/- has already been returned in the account
of the informant's father who is now deceased. Relying upon the



order dated 04.01.2020, learned counsel submits that the Branch Manager who is named in the FIR has been granted regular bail by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the impugned order. It appears from the order that the petitioner, who is posted as Assistant, acted fraudulently in connivance with one Ram Kumar and withdrawn the amount with the help of Aadhar enabled payment system suggesting the prima facie involvement of the petitioner in the fraudulent withdrawal of the money from the account of informant's father, accordingly, I am not inclined to grant the petitioner privilege of anticipatory bail that too after so many years.

6. This application is, accordingly, rejected.

7. However, if the petitioner surrenders and seeks regular bail, the same may be considered by the concerned Court without being prejudiced to the fact that the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner has been rejected by this Court.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

HarshPandey/-

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

