IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30102 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4 Year-2024 Thana- E.C.I.R (GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL) District- Patna

==

Gulab Yadav @ Gulab Jeevaach Yadav S/O Late Jivach Yadav R/o- Bunglow 25, MLC Quarter,Veerchand Patel Road, P.s.- Sachivalay, Dist.- Patna, Bihar.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India through the Assistant Director, Enforcement Directorate, Patna Chandpura Palace, Bank Road, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.

... ... Opposite Party

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.Suraj Samdarshi, Advocate Mr.Avinash Shekhar, Advocate Ms.Abhilasha Jha, Advocate Ms.Simran Kumari, Advocate Mr. Vijay Shankar Tiwary, Advocate
For the ED	:	Mr.Zohaib Hossain, Spl. counsel for ED Mr.Tuhin Shankar, Advocate Mr.Prabhat Kr. Singh, Spl.PP ED Mr.Pranjal Tripathi, Advocate Mr.Vishal Kr.Singh, LC ED Mr.Kartik Sabharwal, Advocate Ms.Aashi Singh, LC ED

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA

C.A.V. ORDER

15 26-09-2025 Heard Mr. Suraj Samdarshi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Zohaib Hossai, learned Special counsel appearing for the Enforcement Directorate.

2. The present application has been filed on behalf of the petitioner for grant of regular bail in connection with Special (PMLA) Case No. 10/2024 (arising out of ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 and addendum dated

20.09.2024) for the alleged offences under Sections 3 and 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, pending in the Court of Learned District and Sessions Judge cum Special Judge PMLA, Patna.

3. The petitioner remains in judicial custody since 19.10.2024. Petitioner has two criminal antecedents which are (1) Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023 and; (2) Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 124/2024.

4. The factual background of the prosecution case

(i) The Directorate of Enforcement (in short the **'ED'**) registered ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 on the basis of predicate/scheduled offences in Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023 dated 09.01.2023 and addendum ECIR dated 20.09.2024 registered on the basis of Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2024 dated 14.09.2024.

(ii) After completion of the investigation, the ED has filed complaint under section 44 and 45 of the PMLA Act, 2002 vide prosecution complaint dated 16.12.2024. From perusal of complaint, it reveals that the gist of investigation conducted under PMLA 2002 has been incorporated. More specifically, the under para 11.3 at Page 162 of the prosecution complaint, the findings with respect to petitioner has been incorporated. Under Para 13.2 (page 196) the details with respect to petitioner qua generating and layering of proceeds of crime have been incorporated. Under para 14.2 (page 204) the specific role of petitioner has been detailed.

(iii) The allegation in brief is that Sanjeev Hans being a government official colluded with his accomplice, such as Sunil Sinha, Gulaab Yadav, for allegedly embezzling government funds and for manipulating amount of various government tenders for personal gain through corruption.

(iv) It is alleged that Gulab Yadav conspired with servant Lalit and Sanjeev Hans in raping Gayatri Kumari on the pretext of making her a member of Bihar State Women's Commission. It is alleged that Shri Gulab Yadav, Sanjeev, Hans, and others have indulged in offence of cheating and is honestly inducing delivery of property.

(v) The facts, which give rise to the present application is that one Gayatri Kumari filed a complaint case, *albeit* mischievous and frivolous, against Sanjeev Hans and petitioner bearing Complaint Case No. 1122/2021 levelling several allegations therein, but not limited to allegation of rape. The Learned ACJM-1st Class, Danapur vide order dated 06.01.2023 passed an order under section 156(3) of the Cr.P.C for registration of a FIR.

(vi) Consequent thereto, Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023 was registered on 09.01.2023 for alleged offences under Section 323, 341, 376, 376D, 420, 313, 120 B, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act 2020.

(vii) On the basis of the above FIR, the Directorate of Enforcement, Patna Zonal Office instituted ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 under the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 and commenced purported investigation with respect to alleged money laundering of proceeds of crime allegedly generated from scheduled offence under Section 420 and 120 B.

5. Mr. Samdarshi, further submitted that Sanjeev

Hans filed a criminal writ application bearing Cr.W.J.C No. 310/2023 seeking quashing of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023. Cr.W.J.C No. 310/2023 was allowed vide order dated 06.08.2024, leading to quashing of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023 along with all its consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR including the order dated 06.01.2023 passed by Learned ACJM 1st Class, Danapur.

6. It is submitted that similarly, the petitioner Gulab Yadav filed Cri. Misc. No. 29542 of 2023 before Hon'ble Patna High Court challenging the order dated 06.01.2023 passed by the Learned ACJM 1st Class, Danapur under section 156(3) of Cr.P.C. and also for quashing of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18.2023. Vide order dated 11.05.2023 further proceeding in connection with complaint case no. 1122(C) of 2021, was stayed by Hon'ble Patna High Court.

7. Mr. Samdarshi, submitted that since the FIR pertaining to predicate offence was quashed by Hon'ble Patna Court, the Directorate of Enforcement, was left high and dry with respect to survival of the said ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 in light of the judgment of Hon'ble Apex

Court as available through **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary Vs Union of India since reported in 2022 SCC Online SC 929**, which has been followed in catena of judgements being passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as by various other High Courts, whereunder it is no more *res integra* that in absence of predicate/ scheduled offence due to either acquittal or discharge or quashing thereof, no proceedings under PML Act, 2002 could survive.

8. It is further submitted by Mr. Sandarshi that a trite law that in the event the person named in the criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence is finally absolved by a Court of competent jurisdiction owing to an order of discharge, acquittal or because of quashing of the criminal case (scheduled offence) against him/her, there can be no action for money-laundering against such a person or person claiming through him in relation to the property linked to the stated scheduled offence.

9. It is submitted that in order to overcome this hurdle, in continuing witch-hunting of the petitioner herein, the Joint Director, Directorate of Enforcement, Patna Zonal

Office vide letter no. ECIR/PTZO/04/2024/714 dated 28.08.2024 shared the information allegedly collected during purported investigation and searches were carried out at residential/office premises of Sanjeev Hans and Petitioner namely, Gulab Yadav. It was alleged in the said letter that Sanjeev Hans and Gulab Yadav have acquired disproportionate assets by resorting to corrupt practices by allegedly misusing their official position and public office.

10. It is pointed out by Mr. Samdarshi that on the basis of the information shared by Joint Director Directorate of Enforcement, Patna Zonal Office, Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2024 dated 14.09.2024 was registered under Section 61 and 318 (4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 and Section 7, 12, 13 (1)(a), 13(1)(b) and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, the Special Vigilance Unit, registered. On the basis of Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2024 dated 14.09.2024, ED registered addendum to the ECIR on 20.09.2024.

11. It is submitted by Mr. Samdarshi, learned counsel for the petitioner that even prior to the registration of

Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2024, raids were conducted in the premises of the petitioner and individuals related to him on 16.07.2024. The details of search and and seizure are as follows:-

Sl.No.	Date of search	Place of search	Items seized
1.	16.07.2024	Karad Urban cooperative Bank, Bhosari Branch, Pune	No seizure. Only jewelry valued.
2.	16.07.2024	Office of M/s Ours Packaging LLP at Plot No. A-44, 13 and 14 of Chakan Industrial Area, PH-II, HED, Pune, Wasuli, Pune.	Eight boxes of papers/invoices.
3.	16.07.2024	Flat of Gulab Yadav in Pune. Gulmohar Flat No. 26, Sector -2 Indranayani Nagar, Bhosari, Near Nana Nani Park, Pune.	One Samsung Fold 5 mobile One Apple Iphone 14 belonging to Roshan Gulab Yadav, son of Gulab Yadav.
4.	16.07.2024	Residential premises of Gulab Yadav situated at 684/29 Mithila Niwas, Adinath Nagar, Bhosari, Pune	Document running into 185 pages
5.	16.07.2024	Premises of Gulab Yadav situated at Flat no. 402, Shyam Bindeshwar Apartment, Sharma Path, Rukanpura Patna	Details of Bank account and investment in policies.
6.	16.07.2024	Premises of Ambika Gulab Yadav Bunglow 25 MLC quarters Veerchand Patel Road, Patna	Iphone 15 of Gulab Yadav Iphone 14 Pro of Ambika Gulab Yadav
7.	16.07.2024	Residential premises of Gulab Yadav at Madhubani	Loose sheet of page 1-75
8.	16.07.2024	Premises of M/s Progrowth Enterprises	Loose sheet of Pages 1-132

12. Arguing further, Mr. Samdarshi submitted that petitioner was also summoned to appear before the ED and petitioner duly complied with the same and extended full cooperation in the investigation of ED, but despite petitioner cooperated with the investigation to the best of his capability and handed over all relevant documents as asked for, he was arrested on 18.10.2024 from a hotel situated at New Delhi.

13. It is submitted by Mr. Samdarshi, that ECIR was registered on 14.03.2024 regarding Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023, but information under section 66(2) of the PMLA was shared by the Directorate of Enforcement on 28.08.2024, which registered as Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2024 dated 14.09.2024 on the basis of which ED recorded an addendum dated 20.09.2024 only after quashing of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18.2023 *qua* co-accused Sanjeev Hans.

14. It is submitted by learned counsel that section 66(2) of the PMLA Act, 2002 will apply only as long as there is a valid ongoing investigation by ED. Once the predicate

offence was quashed, the entire action pertaining to money laundering against the petitioner got annulled and came to a halt. It is neither the import of section 66(2) nor does it seem to be the intent of legislature that section 66(2) should authorize the officials of ED to supply information to other agencies, after quashing of predicate offence or after an accused is discharged, or acquitted of a predicate offence. Otherwise it would lead to a never ending string of prosecution, at the behest of ED which will be antithesis of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

15. It is pointed out by Mr. Samdarshi, that ED in sharing the information with another agencies after quashing of the FIR appears malafide, overreaching the settled legal proposition of Hon'ble Supreme Court through its legal report as available in the matter of **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary Vs. Union of India** reported in **2022 SCC OnLine SC 929.**

16. It is pointed out that by sharing the alleged material after quashing of predicate offence only suggest that ED is compelling to register a fresh FIR to make predicate offence survive, which certainly cannot be permitted.

17. In aforesaid context, it is submitted by Mr. Samdarshi, that upon perusal of letter No. ECIR/PTZO/04/2024/714 dated 28.08.2024, it transpired that petitioner and others have acquired disproportionate assets by resorting to corrupt practices by misusing their official position and public offence. Therefore, it is evident that investigating the offence of money laundering with respect to scheduled offence of section 420, Directorate of Enforcement, in fact, travelled beyond the same into the realm of disproportionate assets and has hopelessly tried to create a new predicate offence.

18. In support of cash deposit of Rs. 5.62 Crores in the bank account of petitioner and his family members, it is submitted that cash deposit was received in form of donations received for contesting the elections and income from agriculture and rental, which is duly accounted and reflected in the income tax returns. It is pointed out that as per prosecution complaint, cash deposit in the bank account of Ambika Gulab Yadav, Gulab Yadav, Madhavi Gulab Yadav, Priyanka Gulab Yadav, Sindhu Gulab Yadav has been taken

into account.

19. Explaining further, it is submitted that source of income of petitioner namely, Gulab Yadav is agriculture activities, rental and business proceeds. Source of Ambika Gulab Yadav is agriculture, rental and business proceeds. It is pointed out that source of income of Madhavi Gulab Yadav is rental, business proceeds and tuition fee, whereas the source of income of Sindhu Gulab Yadav is rental income of Ambika Yadav, and her professional income as she is the lawyer and also tuition fee, whereas source of income of Priyanka Gulab Yadav is tuition fee. They filed their respective ITRs but from para 12.9 of the prosecution case (PC), the ITR of only Gulab Yadav and Ambika Gulab Yadav has been taken into account that too qua rental income only and income from agricultural activities and income from other sources have not been taken into consideration. The cash withdrawal from bank account has also not been taken into consideration.

20. It is also submitted that the cash deposit is also explained through their ITRs and therefore allegation qua deposit of Rs. 5.62 Crores is property explained which was

wrongly alleged by ED as unexplained cash deposit.

21. It is also submitted by Mr. Samdarshi that allegation qua liasoning for contractors and facilitating contracts from departments where Sanjeev Hans was holding the charge is completely general and omnibus in nature. No specific details was stated in this regard and moreover, the petitioner was MLA for the period 2015-2020 and for raising the public cause of his constituency, where the co-accused Sanjeev Hans was posted as District Magistrate, therefore, the communication between them is very obvious.

22. It is also submitted by Mr. Samdarshi that allegation against petitioner is also that he is in collusion with one Devendar Singh, layered and laundered proceeding of crime to the tune of Rs. 4.59 Crores. He extended cash loan of Rs. 1.37 Crore delivered to Devinder Singh Anand on instruction of Sanjeev Hans. Explaining this allegation, it is submitted that from the prosecution complaint (PC), it transpires that 184 cash transaction was made from several requisition across India where 26 cash transactions was made from Bihar, which presumed by ED that same transferred only

by this petitioner, which is factually incorrect and without any cogent material.

23. It is submitted that reason for relying upon said allegation for ED is only the statement of Devinder Anand which was subsequently retracted. In this context, it is submitted that cash deposit in the account of Devinder Singh were in fact deposit from different customers, who used to purchase tyres from Devinder Singh. It is pointed out that the relationship of petitioner with Devinder Singh since 1993 as he was in legitimate business relation with Devinder Singh who supplied tyres for the transport business operated by the petitioner, the petitioner also extended financial support to the Devinder Singh over a period of 10 years. The money was sourced from the proceeds of sale of scrap of Tirhut Industries Sugar Mills. The money was provided as loan and till date stands as loan in the books of account of the petitioner, which was also admitted by Devinder Singh.

24. It is also explained by Mr. Samdarshi that as far payment of Rs. 29 Lakhs alleged to be given to Gayatri Kumari, who is the informant of Rupaspur P.S. Case no.

18/2023 but one of the co-accused in Special Vigilance Unit P.S. Case No. 05/2023, is on the basis of chit of paper and statement of Gayatri Kumari, whereas this petitioner made a statement before ED clarified that some payment has been made to her as fee for rendering legal services as she is an advocate. Petitioner has no connection with M/s Bansidhar Construction for awarding any tender and same is also not in his knowledge, therefore, receiving of Rs. 85 Lakhs from M/s Bansidhar Construction is without any cogent material.

25. It is also submitted that property purchased with Praveen Chaudhary was never transferred to this petitioner and moreover, same was also sold by Pradeep Chaudhary to a third person. The petitioner given two cheques of Rs. 20 Lakhs and 15 Lakhs to Pradeep Choudhary, but only one cheque was encashed.

26. It is also pointed out by Mr. Samdarshi that as far CNG Pump in Pune is concerned, it was purchased in the name of wife of Gulab Yadav and the license to run the CNG Pump was in the name of Harvoleen Kaur, wife of Sanjeev Hans. The said land was given on rent to Harvoleen Kaur. It is

pointed out that the property in issue was purchased from one Sunanda Rangnath Hulavale vide sale deed No. 4950 dated 29.07.2015 against consideration of Rs. 1.1 Crore, which was paid by wife of petitioner obtaining loan from different family members. Some of the loan was returned after obtaining a property loan.

27. It is submitted by Mr. Samdarshi that in view of explanation offered aforesaid, it is evident that petitioner cannot be said guilty of committing the scheduled offence as the same is based upon only suspicion lacking any fundamental basis, which may not be the basis for arraying the petitioner as an accused.

28. Arguing further, it is submitted that petitioner was not found in possession of proceed of crime as no cash, FD, Jewelry, property paper etc. was recovered from possession of this petitioner, who thoroughly cooperated during investigation and, therefore, his custody is bad in the eyes of law in view of legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Pankaj Bansal Vs. Union of India and others** reported in **(2024) 7 SCC 576**.

29. It is also submitted by Mr. Samdarshi that the foundational facts qua arrest in view of section 19 of the PMLA Act is also absent in this case as ED is bound to record the **"reasons to believe"** that petitioner is guilty of offence of money laundering. In this context, it is pointed out that it is almost settled proposition of law that recording of **"reasons to believe"** is mandatory and is subject to judicial review. In support of his submission, learned counsel relied upon the legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **V. Senthil Balaji Vs. State and others** since reported in **(2024) 3 SCC 51.** It is further submitted that **"reasons to suspicion"** cannot be construed at par by any prudent imagination as **"reasons to believe".**

30. While concluding argument, it is submitted that petitioner was MLA having deep route in society and there is no chance of his fleeing away and therefore, he satisfies the triple test as available through **P. Chidambaram Vs. ED** since reported in **2019 SCC OnLine SC 1549.** Mr. Samdarshi also relied upon the para 19 of the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Javed Gulam**

Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharastra & Ors. since reported in **2024 SCC Online SC 1693** *qua* speedy trial, which reads as under:

> "If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime."

31. It is pointed out that in the present case 79 witnesses are to be examined and 148 documents running into 26439 pages are to be exhibited, where still trial to begins and, therefore, the petitioner cannot be kept behind the bar for indefinite period against maximum sentence of seven years on cost of his fundamental right *qua* speedy trial.

<u>Submission on behalf of Enforcement Directorate</u>

32. Mr. Zohaib Hossain, learned Special counsel appearing on behalf of the Enforcement Directorate (ED), submitted that petitioner by using his position as MLA was close with Sanjeev Hans and generated proceed of crime to the tune of Rs. 90 Crores approximately. It is further submitted by Mr. Hossain that petitioner failed to explain cash

deposit in his bank account and all family members. It is pointed out that the cash deposit is just and eye wash to make it legitimate by showing earn from different source of income. It is submitted that merely on the basis of ITR, it cannot be said that petitioner was not involved in layering and laundering of money. It is also submitted that by Mr. Hossain that huge cash was deposited in the bank accounts linked with Devinder Singh Anand and his entities M/s Anand Trading Corporation which provide cash loan to this petitioner. The petitioner also made payment of huge cash of Rs. 29 Lakhs to Ms. Gayatri Kumari, who is the informant of Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023. It is also submitted that wife of petitioner started work of CNG station in Pune (Maharashtra). It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that still the first schedule offence as Rupaspur P.S. Case No. 18/2023 against petitioner is surviving as it was not quashed by this High Court rather it was stayed only.

33. It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that Hon'ble Supreme Court has categorically held in **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary's case** that offence under PMLA is an

independent offence. Therefore, any layering and laundering constitute an offence under section 3 & 4 of ED Act. In support of his submission, Mr. Hossain relied upon **para 109 & 134** of **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary's case (supra),** which reads as under

> "**109.** Tersely put, it is only such property which is derived or obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence that can be regarded as proceeds of crime. The authorities under the 2002 Act cannot resort to action against any person for money laundering on an assumption that the property recovered by them must be proceeds of crime and that a scheduled offence has been committed, unless the same is registered with the jurisdictional police or pending inquiry by way of complaint before the competent forum. For, the expression "derived or obtained" is indicative of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence already accomplished. Similarly, in the event the person named in the criminal activity relating to a scheduled offence is finally absolved by a court of competent jurisdiction owing to an order of discharge, acquittal or because of quashing of the criminal case (scheduled offence) against him/her, there can be no action for money laundering against such a person or person claiming through him in relation to the property linked to the stated scheduled offence. This interpretation alone can be countenanced on the basis of the provisions of the 2002 Act, in particular Section 2(1)(*u*) read with Section 3. Taking any other view would be rewriting of these provisions and disregarding the express language of the definition clause "proceeds of crime", as it obtains as of now."
>
> **134.** From the bare language of Section 3 of the 2002 Act, it is amply clear that the offence of money laundering is an independent offence regarding the process or activity connected with the proceeds of crime which had been derived or obtained as a result of criminal activity relating to or in relation to a scheduled offence. The process or activity can be in any form — be it one of concealment, possession, acquisition, use of proceeds of

crime as much as projecting it as untainted property or claiming it to be so….. …. … "

34. While arguing further, it is submitted by Mr. Hossain that upon investigation under PMLA in respect of the petitioner reveal the following:

a. Bank account analysis of Gayatri Kumari, Sunil Kumar Sinha and his employees confirms the banking transactions.

b. Recovery of Receipt of cash deposits in the account of Gayatri Kumari extracted from mobile of Gulab Yadav vide panchanama dated.

c. Extracts of whatsapp chats between Sanjeev Hans-Gulab Yadav. vide panchanama dated 14.08.2024 and 16.08.2024 shows his close association with other accused.

d. Whatsapp chats between Gulab Yadav-Devinder Singh Anand and Gulab Yadav-Nilesh, driver of Gulab Yadav extracted from mobile of Gulab Yadav.

e. Cash deposits in the account of M/s Anand Trading Corporation.

f. Analysis of bank accounts of Gulab Yadav and his family members showing cash deposits.

g. Statement of Shri Jitendra Singh of M/s Bansidhar Constructions regarding giving bribe of Rs. 85 Lakhs to Gulab Yadav.

h. Analysis of ITRs filed by Gulab Yadav and his family for Assessment Year 2012-13 to 2023-24.

i. Recovery of cheque during the search at Praveen Chaudhary vide Panchanama dated 16.07.2024.

35. It is pointed out by Mr. Hossain that in view of **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary's case** rendered by Three Judges Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the necessity of arrest is not a factor to be considered under section 19 of the PMLA 2002. Learned counsel for the ED also relied upon the legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Tarun Kumar Vs. Enforcement Directorate [2023 SCC OnLine SC 1486]; Rohit Tandon Vs. Directorate of Enforcement [(2018) 11 SCC 46]; Enforcement Directorate Vs. Aditya Tripathi [2023 SCC OnLine SC 619].**

36. From aforesaid factual and legal discussion, it transpires that *prima facie* investigation done by ED reveals that huge cash was deposited in the account of petitioner and he was in relation with co-accused Sanjeev Hans as the property of wife of petitioner was given on rent to the wife of Sanjeev Hans. Several co-accused persons supported the involvement of petitioner through their statement recorded under section 50 of the PMLA Act, 2002, *qua* layering and laundering of proceed of crime with co-accused Sanjeev Hans.

Close association and business activities with Sanjeev Hans is *prima facie* admitted position in view of aforesaid factual submission, accordingly, it cannot be said that this Court is satisfied that there are reasonable grounds for believing that petitioner is not guilty and would not likely to commit any offence, on enlarging bail, twin conditions, which must satisfied before granting bail under Section 45 of the PMLA Act, 2002.

But,

As petitioner remained in custody for about **eleven months** against maximum sentence of seven years i.e. since **19.10.2024**, where during trial total **79 witness** are required to be examined and **149 documents**, which running into **26739 pages** are required to be exhibited by the trial court, suggesting *prima facie* that trial is not likely to conclude in near future, violating the fundamental right of petitioner as available under Article 21 of the Constitution of India *qua* speedy trial, which yet to initiate, accordingly, above-named petitioner is directed to be released on bail, furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned District and Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge, PMLA, Patna, in connection with Special (PMLA) Case No. 10/2024 (arising out of ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 and Addendum dated 20.09.2024), subject to the condition as laid down under Section 437(3) Cr.P.C/Section 480(3) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (in short "B.N.S.S.").

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J)

Rajeev/-

U		T	