

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16071 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-173 Year-2024 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Gaya

Harshit Purnima @ Harsit Purnima S/o- Jai Prakash Pandey Resident of
Village- Chaparda Road, Paluhar, P.S.- Magadh Medical, District- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ujjawal Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Sangeeta Sharma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

2 27-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Gaya
Cyber P.S. Case No. 173 of 2024 instituted for the offences
under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 111, 61(2)
of the B.N.S. and Section 66(C), 66(D) of the I.T. Act.

3. As per prosecution case, the accused persons
including the petitioner were running a call center in the name
of Paynol Solution Pvt. Ltd. and were committing Cyber fraud.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged
against her and has falsely been implicated in the present case
merely on the basis of suspicion. The petitioner has not



committed any offence as alleged in the F.I.R. The petitioner is the employee of the company, in question, and he has nothing to do with the Cyber crime as he was working on the direction of the head of the Company. He further submits that nothing incriminating has been recovered from the conscious/physical possession of the petitioner and he has no concern with the seized articles. The petitioner is a lady and has never indulged in any Cyber crime as alleged in the F.I.R. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 01.12.2024 without any rhyme or reason.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, stating that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature. He further submits that the prayer for bail of the co-accused namely Amit Sharma @ Amit Kumar has already been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 19.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9423 of 2025. The prayer for bail of the co-accused Yash Raj has also been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 19.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 9598 of 2025. The petitioner is named in the F.I.R. and, hence, she does not deserve bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and



considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner, above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

rishi/-

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

