

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27422 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-187 Year-2024 Thana- INDUSTRIAL AREA District- Vaishali

Ritesh Kumar S/o Sudhir Prasad Singh R/o vill - Baltara, P.S.- Chautham,
Distt.- Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anurag Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Area P.S. Case No. 187 of 2024, dated 14.12.2024, lodged under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(2), 61(2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as “BNS, 2023”).

3. As per the prosecution, the allegation against the petitioner is that, in the CTET December 2024 Examination, another person appeared at the examination centre using the roll number allotted to the petitioner, Ritesh Kumar. Upon verification, the impersonator was identified as Rupak Kumar, a co-accused in the case.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. It is submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedents. Counsel further submits that the petitioner had misplaced his admit card and was completely unaware that someone else had appeared in the examination using his credentials. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to comply with all conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner is the direct beneficiary of the fraudulent act, and as such, his plea that the admit card was merely misplaced and that someone else appeared in the examination without his knowledge is unsustainable and not acceptable.

6. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Sudhanshu/-

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

