

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6848 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-38 Year-2022 Thana- ECONOMIC OFFENCES, BIHAR  
District- Patna

=====

Aman Kumar S/o Ram Pratap Singh R/o Village- Yogyadih, PO and PS-  
Guthani, District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Economics Offence Unit through it Superintendent of Police Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                                          |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr.Dhirdyuti Kumar Verma, Advocate       |
| For E.O.U.               | : | Mr. Vishwanath Prasad Sinha, Sr.Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha, APP               |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

5      04-08-2025                      Heard Mr.Dhirdyuti Kumar Verma, learned counsel  
  
for the petitioner, Mr. Vishwanath Prasad Sinha, learned senior  
counsel appearing for the E.O.U. assisted by Mr. Vijay Anand,  
learned Advocate and Mr.Nirmal Kumar Sinha, learned  
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in  
connection with Economic Offences P.S. Case No. 38 of 2022,  
FIR dated 03.12.2022 registered for the offences punishable  
under Sections 420,467,468,471,472,120B and 34 of IPC.

3. As per the prosecution case, an office was operating  
in the Boring Canal Road, in the name of Admission Provider  
and they are getting admissions done illegally in BBOSE and in



their places, other student (scholars) appeared instead of original students and in connivance with the staffs of BBOSE were inflating their marks, false and fabricated marks sheet were prepared and on the basis, thereof they were being admitted in different courses. The proprietor of the office in return was extracting heavy amount from the guardians of students. It is further alleged that petitioner was working as a Currier/Messenger in BBOSE.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR. Petitioner is not named in the FIR. The name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the disclosure/confessional statement of co-accused person, namely, Faheem Ahamad and except the disclosure made by the co-accused person, no other cogent material has come during investigation against the petitioner to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence.

5. Learned senior counsel for the E.O.U., on the basis of the material available on the record and the case diary, has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the



petitioner and submits that apart from that, the disclosure made by the co-accused person, C.D.R. location of the petitioner suggests that he was regularly touched with other co-accused persons.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, petitioner has clean antecedent, name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the disclosure/confessional statement of co-accused person, namely, Faheem Ahamad, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000 (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-I, Patna in connection with Economic Offences P.S. Case No. 38 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of the BNSS,2023 and with other following conditions:-

(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient



reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his/her criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

**(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)**

Nitesh/-

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

