

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16634 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-599 Year-2022 Thana- VAISALI COMPLAINT CASE District-
Vaishali

-
1. Sarita Devi wife of Sanjeev Kumar @ Pappu Village- Lawapur PS -Mahnar, Dist- Vaishali
 2. Sanjeev Kumar @ Pappu son of Baleshwar Chaudhary Village- Lawapur PS -Mahnar, Dist- Vaishali
 3. Manoj Gop @ Manoj Kumar son of Baleshwar chaudhary Village- Lawapur PS -Mahnar, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Bhupendra Prasad Singh son of Late Dharamdeo Prasad Singh R/vill - Sherpur Chisti, Ps- Ganga Bridge, PO- Jadhua, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dhirendra Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Anzarul Haque Sahara

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 05-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a complaint case punishable for the offence under Sections 409/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The complainant, who was posted in Mahnar block as Jan Sewak, has alleged that accused persons were entrusted with Rs. 12,43,900/- by the State Government for construction of road. However, these petitioners, in conspiracy with other accused persons, misappropriated entire amount and did not complete said work and thus, committed criminal breach of trust.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and have committed no offence. Petitioner no. 1 is Prakhand Pramukh, petitioner no. 2 is husband of petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 3 is their associate and have no concern with construction of road. In fact, no cheque has been issued to these petitioners and as such, there is no question of embezzlement of government money. The cheque of said amount was given to complainant by the B.D.O. Mahnar block and as such, complainant was responsible for the said work, but after lapse of six years in order to save his own skin this complaint has been filed.

5. However, learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. with specific accusation that they alongwith other co-accused persons did not complete the allotted work under government scheme and thereby, misappropriated government money.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay

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

