

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8913 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2011 Thana- PANDARAK District- Patna

Madan Mohan Gupta S/o- Sanjivan Ram @ Sanjeewan Ram Resident of
MIG- 250 Satsang Bhawan Kankarbagh Sampatchak PS- Kankarbagh Distt-
Patna Bihar Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kundan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bharat Lal, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

- 3 15-04-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.
2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 409, 420 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.
3. As per the prosecution case, on 14.10.2022, informant received a notice from Panjab National Bank, Bhadaur Branch in District-Patna, wherein Paru Mahto was written as son of informant, whereas informant had no son in the name of Paru Mahto. It is further alleged that as per notice, loan of Rs. 1 lac was taken by said Paru Mahto from the Bank. Informant has further alleged that several villagers had also received such notice, though they never took loan from the bank. It is alleged that petitioner, while posted as Agriculture officer in Bhadaur branch of Punjab National Bank, District Patna, embezzled Government fund along with other accused persons using forged documents.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. However, his name has come in the case on the confessional statement of co-accused Sudhanshu Kumar, Manager, Punjab National Bank,



Momarkhabad branch. It is further submitted that during course of investigation, statements of several beneficiaries have been recorded but they have not said any thing against the petitioner. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer for bail. He submits that during investigation, it has come that the petitioner, being Agriculture officer in the bank, embezzled Government funds along with other accused persons.

6. Petitioner has moved this Court for grant of pre-arrest bail in 2025, though the case is of 2011. There is no explanation as to why petitioner took 14 years in moving this Court which shows that the petitioner has got no reasonable apprehension of his arrest in the case.

7. Considering the nature of accusation and gross delay in moving this pre-arrest bail application, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Shashi

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

