

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13454 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-141 Year-2017 Thana- BALIYA District- Begusarai

Pranav Praveen Son of Ram Naresh singh village- Hanumangarhi, Ps-
Muffasil, Dist- Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1. The State of Bihar
- 2. Santosh Kumar Singh, S/O Parmanand Singh LAw Officer, Bihar Writer
Safeguard Pvt. Ltd. Patna. Hanuman Nagar, 90 Ft Road Ps- Kankarbagh,
Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

with
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 19065 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-141 Year-2017 Thana- BALIYA District- Begusarai

Ramudgar Mahto Son of Anandlal Mahto Resident of village- Thahra, Post
Gopalpur, P.S.- Vahin O.P., District -Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1. The State of Bihar
- 2. Santosh Kumar Singh Son of Parmand Singh Resident of Village- Hanuman
Nagar, 90 feet Road, Thana- Kankarbagh, Distt.- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 13454 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rohit Raj, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, APP
(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 19065 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Asmita Bharti, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH
MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

7 28-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Balia



P.S. Case No. 141 of 2017, instituted for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409, 420 and 120(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the petitioners and others who were doing the duty of depositing cash in the ATM machine are said to have defalcated Rs. 11,62,800/-.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in the present case. Charge-sheet has been submitted in this case. No incriminating material have been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners.

5. In Cr. Misc. No. 13454 of 2025, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is delay of about five months in lodging the FIR. The petitioner was an employee in the company of the informant but he did not have the password of the alleged ATM or vault. It is further submitted that the petitioner was not on duty at the time of occurrence. The petitioner is in custody since 20.12.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

6. In Cr. Misc. No. 19065 of 2025, learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner was an employee in informant's company and he quit his job in the month of



December, 2016 and the FIR was lodged on 14.06.2017. The present case was falsely filed by the informant against the petitioner. The petitioner is in custody since 18.12.2024 and has got no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners and submits that the petitioners are named in the FIR and was posted in the firm at the time of occurrence. It is further submitted that witnesses have supported the prosecution case. Hence the petitioners do not deserve the privilege of bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, nature of accusation and the gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners at this stage.

7. The prayer is rejected. The trial Court is directed to expedite the Trial. However, if the trial is not concluded within a period of six months from the date of receipt/production, the petitioners will have liberty to renew their prayer for bail in the Court below.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

