IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28571 of 2025
Arising Out of PS. Case No.-4 Year-2024 Thana- E.C.I.R (GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL) District- Patna

==

Praveen Chaudhary @ Praveen Kumar @ Praveen Kumar Chaudhary, Son of Late Raj Kumar Chaudhary, R/o D-144/E, First Floor, Hari Nagar Ashram, P.S.- Sunlight Colony, New Delhi - 110014.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India through the Joint Director of the Directorate of Enforcement, 1st Floor, Patna Chandpura Place, Bank Road, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna – 800001.

... ... Opposite Parties

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Mrigank Mauli, Senior Advocate Mr. Sanket, Advocate Mr. Navin Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. Shankar Kumar Thakur, Advocate
For the E.D.	:	Mr. Zoheb Hossain, Special Counsel Mr. Tuhin Shankar, retained counsel Mr. Prabhat Kumar Singh, Spl. P.P. Mr. Pranjal Tripathi, Advocate Mr. Vishal Kumar Singh, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA

CAV ORDER

15 08-10-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. The present application has been preferred for grant of bail to the above-named petitioner, who has been made accused (as accused no. 4 in the supplementary prosecution Complaint dated 09.01.2025) instituted for the offences under section 3 & punishable under section 4 of the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as the **"PMLA"**), arising out of Enforcement Case Information Report (in short the **"ECIR"**) bearing no.

PTZO/04/2024 dated 14.03.2024 read with Addendum ECIR dated 20.09.2024 corresponding to Special (Trial) PMLA SC No. 10/2024.

3. In brief, as per ECIR case, the petitioner was a close associate of Sanjeev Hans one I.A.S. Officer of Bihar Cadre and Gulab Yadav, Ex-MLA, who assisted them in illegal financial transactions and in layering, laundering and concealment of the proceeds of crime. Financial transactions were traced between their accounts, including payments from the petitioner's company to the entities linked to the M/s Anand Trading Corporation, a known associate of Sanjeev Hans and Gulab Yadav. The petitioner acted as a sub-contractor for the firms associated with the Bihar Government's Energy Department. The petitioner was alleged to involve in recommending the transfer of government officials and facilitating meetings between private contractors and Sanjeev Hans. It is alleged that the petitioner purchased one flat bearing No. C-35 in Anand Niketan, New Delhi ostensibly for Sanjeev Hans with actual consideration money of Rs. 9.60 crores out of which, Rs. 3.35 crores was paid in

cash. The sale consideration was shown as Rs.6.25 crores. Further, Gulab Yadav and petitioner jointly purchased one property at Yusuf Sarai in New Delhi. During search, a blank signed cheque of Rs.2.75 crores related to the said property's earlier owner was seized from the petitioner's residence, which shows his involvement in laundering the proceeds of crime. WhatsApp chats, financial records and Sections 17 and 50 statements confirm coordinated efforts by the petitioner and Sanjeev Hans to layer and conceal the proceeds of crime and thus petitioner alleged to involved in assisting Sanjeev Hans and Gulab Yadav in generating the proceeds of crime to the tune of Rs. 9.60 crores and Rs. 70 lakhs through corrupt practices during the period March, 2023 and 2014-15 respectively. From Assessment years 2017-18 to 2023-24, the total income in the hands of the petitioner and his wife is of Rs. 3,02,72,366/- only against which, they acquired assets worth Rs.12.81 crores.

ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONER

4. Mr. Mrigank Mauli, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an

innocent person and has falsely been implicated in this case due to ulterior motive for the reason that petitioner did not derive or obtain any property directly or indirectly as a result of any of the criminal activities relating to the scheduled offences. It is pointed out by Mr. Mauli that petitioner has not committed any of the offences listed in Part-A, Part-B or Part-C of the Schedule appended to the PMLA, 2002. No offence is made out against the petitioner under Section 318(4) of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023 (in short 'BNS') or Sections 7, 12, 13(1)(a), 13(1)(b) and 13(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act (in short 'P.C. Act').

5. Explaining the purchase of flat No.C-35, third floor, Anand Niketan, New Delhi, it is submitted by Mr. Mauli that the said property was purchased by petitioner through registered sale deed dated 24.03.2023 through which one Gudo Luthra sold said flat to the petitioner after receiving the total consideration money of Rs.6.25 crores only. Out of total consideration money of Rs.6.25 crores, the petitioner paid Rs. 3 crores to the vendor through Housing loan taken from the Union Bank of India, Hauz Khas branch, New Delhi in March,

2023 and Rs. 3.25 crores was paid from his savings accruing in that bank. The purchase price of Rs. 6.25 crores is above the prevailing circle rate of Rs. 6,06,90,776/- for flat No. C-33 in Anand Niketan, New Delhi.

6. In this connection, it is submitted that the petitioner did not pay even a single paisa to Gudo Luthra over and above the actual price of Rs. 6.25 crores. The allegation of Enforcement Directorate (in short 'ED') that the petitioner paid Rs. 3.35 crores in cash to the vendor for the purchase of flat No. C-35 in Anand Niketan is false and fabricated. No proceeds of crime, as alleged, was used in it.

7. It is further submitted that on 28.06.2023, the petitioner executed a rent agreement in favour of Harloveleen Kaur (wife of Sanjeev Hans) with respect to C-35 flat of Anand Niketan, New Delhi on monthly rental of Rs. 1,50,000/-. The tenancy was created for the period 01.06.2023 to 31.05.2026. She paid rent to the petitioner regularly, which is evident from the bank transactions. It is pointed out that petitioner is the exclusive and real owner of the C-35 flat in Anand Niketan, New Delhi and the status of

the wife of Sanjeev Hans is not more than tenant and having any semblance of title over C-35 flat. None of them paid any part of the consideration/purchase price to the vendor Gudo Luthra. This is not a *benami* property.

8. Explaining further, Mr. Mauli submitted that the claim of ED that the broker Amit Vadhera disclosed in his mail that the purchase price of C-35 flat in Anand Niketan was Rs.9.60 crores and its final draft of sale agreement also evidenced the same price are no evidence in eyes of law as petitioner is not a signatory to any of the e-mails communication between Amit Vadhera and Gudo Luthra nor did he sign the final draft of the sale agreement allegedly valued at Rs. 9.60 crores.

9. Explaining the other property i.e. T-95, Third Floor, Yusuf Sarai, New Delhi is concerned, it is submitted that same was purchased in 2014 in the joint name of the petitioner and Gulab Yadav from one Pradeep Kumar Choudhary on payment of total consideration money of Rs.70 lakhs. They paid one fourth (1/4th) of the sale price. No proceeds of crime was invested in it. However, later on, the

owner of T-95, Third Floor, Yusuf Sarai sold said property to another person. The petitioner and Gulab Yadav were thus defrauded. They filed Civil Suit DJ No. 87 of 2022 before the South District, Saket District and Session Court, New Delhi for appropriate relief. It is still pending consideration.

10. It is further submitted by Mr. Mauli *qua* explaining the recovery of a cheque worth Rs.2.75 crores as seized from the house of petitioner that the petitioner worked in the sugar mill of Tirhut Industries Limited, where Pradeep Kumar Chaudhary, earlier owner of flat was its Managing Director during the period 2011-12. For the works done by the petitioner, Pradeep Kumar Chaudhary issued a cheque of Rs.2.75 crores to him from his saving account, which was found in his house. This amount finds place in their balance-sheets, which had no concern with Yusuf Sarai property.

11. It is submitted by Mr. Mauli that the petitioner was acquainted with Sanjeev Hans since 2014-15. The petitioner never influenced Mr. Hans to accomplish any government work either for himself or for others in order to gain monetary benefits. It is pointed out that from

27.07.2020 to 01.08.2024, Sanjeev Hans was Principal Secretary of the Energy Department, Government of Bihar. The petitioner was working as sub-contractor with the Universal Cable Limited and the KEC International Limited respectively from 2010 and 2013. The petitioner did not get any contract work from the Energy Department, Government of Bihar during the entire period of Sanjeev Hans while he was Principal Secretary.

12. It is pointed out that the ED has alleged that during the Assessment Years 2017-18 to 2023-24, the petitioner and his family acquired assets worth Rs.12.81 crores approximately against the total income of Rs.3,02,72,366/- of the petitioner and his wife together, which is a false and fabricated statement *qua* petitioner.

13. Explaining the income of the petitioner, it is pointed out by Mr. Mauli that petitioner was running a firm M/s Splicenet Construction firm involved in the business of cabling work throughout India. The petitioner's income from cabling business was Rs.4,00,44,923/- during the periods 2007-08 to 2023-24. This amount earned bank interest of

Rs.37,81,802/-. He got rental amount of Rs.13,50,000/- for the period 2023-25 thus, the total sum comes to Rs.4,51,76,725/-. The ED has not taken into consideration the aforesaid bank interest.

14. Explaining further, it is pointed out that the petitioner's wife earned Rs. 15,64,800/- from salary during the period 2008-09 to 2015-16. Her cabling business income for the period 2009-10 and 2015-16 to 2023-24 is of Rs.77,36,751/-. The aggregate bank interest come to Rs.13,05,621/-. Her total sum is Rs.1,06,07,172/-. The ED has not taken into consideration the aforesaid bank interest also.

15. It is pointed out that the details of properties purchased by the petitioner himself and in partnership with others and their gross purchase value is of Rs.11,54,25,000/- comprising their proportionate investments. The petitioner's wife also purchased one property. The petitioner has not paid the entire consideration money of those properties.

16. Besides aforesaid, it is pointed out by Mr. Mauli that the petitioner suffered from high blood sugar, blood

pressure, fatty lever of grade-3, frozen shoulder and restlessness due to heart problem and acute joint pain. The petitioner's physical condition is not well. He requires regular medical treatment from reputed doctors. His condition is deteriorating fast in jail, which is a serious life threat to petitioner due to complications arising from aforementioned ailments.

17. Arguing further, Mr. Mauli submitted that ED has falsely alleged that petitioner sent transfer requests of the officials of Bihar Government working under the charge of Sanjeev Hans. In fact, he never made any request to Sanjeev Hans to transfer government officials from one place to another and no any such transfer was done. It is also pointed out that the allegation Sanjeev Hans used the credit card of the petitioner for activation of his apple ID, it is pointed that the said card was used for activation only. The activation process was not chargeable. Only card number was used. Thus, to say that the proceed of crime was used in that regard is palpably false.

18. It is pointed out that the petitioner was known

to Sanjeev Hans long back and on auspicious occasions, some simple gifts were given, that too, with no intent to get favour or undue benefit. The petitioner has reimbursed the cost of occasional air tickets booked for Sanjeev Hans. No illegal money was ever used in that regard.

19. Arguing further Mr. Mauli submitted that in view of all such aforesaid factual discussions, no *prima facie* case is made out against this petitioner and, therefore, the presumption as available under Section 24 of the PMLA is not applicable against the petitioner in view of **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary vs. Union of India [(2023)12 SCC 1]** as discussed in para-239, which is as under:-

> "**239.** Be it noted that the legal presumption under Section 24(a) of the 2002 Act would apply when the person is charged with the offense of money laundering and his direct or indirect involvement in any process or activity connected with the proceeds of a crime is established. The existence of the proceeds of a crime is, therefore, a foundational fact to be established by the prosecution, including the person's involvement in any process or activity connected therewith. Once these foundational facts are established by the prosecution, the onus must then shift on the person facing the charge of money laundering to rebut the legal presumption that the

> proceeds of a crime are not involved in money laundering, by producing evidence which is within his personal knowledge. In other words, the expression "presume" is not conclusive. It also does not follow that the legal presumption that the proceeds of crime are involved in money laundering is to be invoked by the authority or the court, without providing an opportunity to the person to rebut the same by leading evidence within his personal knowledge **[Sarbananda Sonowal v. Union of India, (2005) 5 SCC 665]"**.

20. It is submitted that in view of aforesaid factual allegations, it can be safely said that the petitioner is satisfying the twin conditions of Section 45 of the PMLA apart that, he is also an ill and sick person, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail. It is submitted that the petitioner is a man of clean antecedent and he is in custody since 18.10.2024.

21. Arguing further, it is submitted that beside aforesaid, in present case number of witnesses and documents are required to examine during the trial, which yet to be initiated, suggesting *prima facie* that trial may not likely to conclude in near future, which is appearing in violation of fundamental right of petitioner as available *qua* speedy trial

under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, and, therefore, on this ground alone, the petitioner deserves bail.

22. In support of submission of delayed trial, a reliance has been made on decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Manish Sisodia vs. Directorate of Enforcement, [SLP (Crl.) No.8781 of 2024]** and in support of submission of violation of fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, reliance has been made on **Prem Prakash vs. Union of India through the Directorate of Enforcement [2024 INSC 637],** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court categorically held as under:-

> "All that Section 45 of PMLA mentions is that certain conditions must be satisfied. The principle that, 'bail is the rule and jail is the exception' is only a paraphrasing of Article 21 of the Constitution of India, which states that no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to the procedure established by law. Liberty of the individual is always a rule and deprivation is the exception. Deprivation can only be by the procedure established by law, which must be a valid and reasonable procedure. Section 45 of PMLA, by imposing twin conditions, does not rewrite this principle to mean that deprivation is the norm and liberty is the exception. As set out earlier, all that is required is that in cases

where bail is subject to the satisfaction of twin conditions, those conditions must be satisfied."

ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF ED:

23. Mr. Zohaib Hossain, learned special counsel while arguing for the ED submitted that the accused/petitioner Praveen Chaudhary hails from Madhubani district, the same district to which, Gulab Yadav belongs and where Sanjeev Hans served as District Magistrate during 2010-2012. It is pointed out that petitioner has an old acquaintance of Gulab Yadav and financial transactions have been noticed between them, even petitioner arranged financial transactions from his company's account to M/s Anand Trading Corporation of one Devinder Singh Anand (another close associate of both Sanjeev Hans and Gulab Yadav). It is submitted that Rabindra Chaudhary is common Chartered Accountant for M/s Progrowth Enterprises (proprietorship of Smt. Harloveleen Kaur, w/o Sanjeev Hans), Devinder Singh Anand, Sanjeev Hans and his family, Praveen Chaudhary (petitioner) and Gulab Yadav and his family. It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that from perusal of data extracted from the WhatsApp chats between Praveen Chaudhary and

Sanjeev Hans and also between Praveen Chaudhary and Abhishek Sil and its corroboration with their statements recorded under Section 50 of the PMLA reveals a cordial relationship between them.

24. It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that during the course of investigation, it was revealed that petitioner engages in liaison work for entities participating in tenders for Energy Department of Bihar, leveraging his close association with Sanjeev Hans to ensure the smooth evaluation of tender related process. It is also pointed out that while recording statement under Section 50 of the PMLA on 15.11.2024, Abhishek Sil stated that his role primarily involves participation in the tendering process. Abhishek Sil also stated that that he met Sanjeev Hans, the then Chairman-cum-Managing Director (CMD) of M/s BSPHCL on two occasions and said meeting was arranged by petitioner, who is the proprietor of M/s Splicenet Construction, a sub-contractor of M/s KEC International Limited. It is pointed out by Mr. Hossain that during investigation, it was revealed that petitioner is a sub-contractor for various firms, who are

vendors/sub-contractors for Energy Department, Government of Bihar, where Hans had worked as Principal Secretary till 01.08.2024.

25. It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that while recording statement under Section 17 of the PMLA on 16.11.2024, it was revealed by petitioner that he purchased the flat at Third Floor, C-35, Anand Niketan, New Delhi on 24.03.2023 from one Gudo Luthra for a total consideration amount of Rs.6.25 crores. What he had arranged via overdraft of Rs. 3.5 crores from his company M/s Splicenet Construction and loan of Rs.3 crores from bank.

26. It is pointed out that upon search of the residential premises of Sri Amit Vadhera, who had acted as broker between Gudo Luthra and Praveen Chaudhary (petitioner) and also as per statement of Amit Vadhera recorded on 31.07.2024 under Section 17 of the PMLA, 2002, it appears that the actual amount for purchase of flat was Rs. 9.60 crores suggesting *prima facie* that Rs. 3.35 crores was paid in cash to the vendor, which was nothing but the proceed of crime.

27. It is submitted by Mr. Hossain that while the offence of money laundering is dependent on the existence of the predicate offence but, it is also an independent offence, which seeks to prosecute the persons dealing with proceeds of crime. In other words, the offence of money laundering is not concerned with the ingredients of the alleged predicate offence. It is only concerned with the generation of proceeds of crime and whether the accused has dealt with such proceeds of crime. The independent nature of the offence of the money laundering and its connection with scheduled offence has been explained by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Vijay Madanlal Choudhary case** (supra), which are as under:-

> "**253.** Tersely put, it is only such property that is derived or obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offense can be regarded as proceeds of crime. The authorities under the 2002 Act cannot resort to action against any person for money laundering on the assumption that the property recovered by them must be proceeds of crime and that a scheduled offense has been committed, unless it is registered with the jurisdictional police or pending inquiry by way of complaint before the competent forum. For example,

the expression "derived or obtained" is indicative of criminal activity relating to a scheduled offense already accomplished. Similarly, in the event the person named in the criminal activity relating to a scheduled offense is finally acquitted by a court of competent jurisdiction owing to an order of discharge. Enforce acquittal or because of quashing of the criminal case (scheduled offense) against him/her, there can be no action for money laundering against such a person or person claiming through him/her in relation to the property linked to the stated scheduled offense. 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 these provisions and disregarding the express language of the definition clause "proceeds of crime," as it obtains as of now.

XXX XXX XXX

269. From the bare language of section 3 of the 2002 Act, it is amply clear that the offense of money laundering is an independent offense 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 offense. The process or activity can be in any form—be it one of concealment, possession, acquisition, or use of proceeds of crime, as much as projecting it as untainted property or claiming it to be so."

28. It is also submitted by Mr. Hossain that as per

provision available under Section 24 of PMLA, 2002, the accused cannot claim bail simply for the reason that no direct evidence of crime is available and where the seriousness of the offence can be grounds to deny bail. The accused has to prove that the property is not related to money laundering. This places a higher burden on the defence compared to most criminal laws. Under the PMLA, direct evidence is not the only means to prove guilt. Circumstantial evidence, combined with the petitioner's proximity to the accused and their actions, can establish that they knowingly assisted in the possession, concealment or use of proceeds of crime. It is pointed out that the petitioner is misleading the court that there is no documentary evidence against him because several forensically extracted WhatsApp chats, banking transactions, statements recorded during search proceeding, e-mail, draft sale deed of the flat owned as *benamidar* of Sanjeev Hans, blank cheques seized from the premises of the accused clearly demonstrate the involvement of the petitioner.

29. While concluding argument, it is submitted by Mr. Hossain that petitioner has acted as a middle-man and

assisted Sanjeev Hans in earning and accommodating the illegal money from corrupt practices and thereby, assisted Sanjeev Hans in layering, laundering and concealment of proceeds of crime. Therefore, the petitioner by resorting to the above-mentioned activities committed the offence of money laundering, which is damaging the financial health of the nation as well as the State of Bihar.

30. In support of his aforesaid submission, Mr. Hossain relied upon the legal report of Hon'ble Supreme Court as available through **Saumay Chaurasia vs. Directorate of Enforcement [Special Leave Petition (Criminal) No.8847 of 2023]**, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court while discussing the ambit of proviso to Section 45 of PMLA has observed that:

> "22. The next question that falls for consideration before the Court is whether the appellant being a woman should be granted the benefit of the first proviso to Section 45 of the PMLA, which reads as under:
>
> > "**45. Offences to be cognizable and non-bailable.-**
> >
> > (1) ………… Provided that a person who is under the age of sixteen years or is a woman or is sick or infirm [or is accused

> either on his own or along with other co-accused of money-laundering a sum of less than one crores rupees], may be released on bail, if the special court so directs:
>
> (2) ----------------------"

24. the use of expression "may be" in the first proviso to Section 45 clearly indicates that the benefit of the said proviso to the category of persons mentioned therein may be extended at the discretion of the Court considering the facts and circumstances of each case, and could not be construed as a mandatory or obligatory on the part of the Court to release them. Similar benevolent provision for granting bail to the category of persons below the age of sixteen years, women, sick or infirm has been made in Section 437 Cr.P.C. and many other special enactments also, however by no stretch of imagination could such provision be construed as obligatory or mandatory in nature, otherwise all serious offences under such special Acts would be committed involving women and persons of tender age below 16 years. No doubt the courts need to be more sensitive and sympathetic towards the category of persons included in the first proviso to Section 45 and similar provisions in the other Acts, as the persons of tender age and women who are likely to be more vulnerable, may sometimes be misused by the unscrupulous elements and made scapegoats for committing such crimes, nonetheless, the courts also should not be oblivious to the fact that nowadays the educated and well placed woman in the society

engage themselves in the commercial ventures and enterprises, and advertently or inadvertently engage themselves in the illegal activities. In essence, the courts should exercise the discretion judiciously using their prudence, while granting the benefit of the first proviso to Section 45 PMLA to the category of persons mentioned therein. The extent of involvement of the persons falling in such category in the alleged offences, the nature of evidence collected by the investigating agency etc., would be material considerations."

31. It is also pointed out that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gautam Kundu Case [(2015) 16 SCC 1]** has categorically observed that the twin conditions of Section 45 of the PMLA, 2002 for grant of bail specified under the said Act have overriding effect on the general provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

32. Countering the argument as raised by learned senior counsel appearing for petitioner, it is pointed out by Mr. Hossain that mere absence of petitioner's signature on the draft agreement or e-mail correspondence does not exonerate him, when other circumstantial and direct evidence clearly points to his role in aiding and facilitating the laundering of illicit funds in the purchase of the said property. It is pointed

out that if petitioner is in jail, he may approach jail authority in terms of Bihar Prison Manual, 2012 for his medical treatment/attentions.

33. From the aforesaid factual and legal submissions, it appears *prima facie* that petitioner was in association with Sanjeev Hans since 2006 onwards. The acquaintance with Sanjeev Hans was also not disputed by the petitioner. The explanation *qua* draft agreement exchanged between broker and vendor specifying the amount as Rs.9.60 crores cannot be ignored at this stage merely that the e-mail was not signed by petitioner. The e-mail was not merely informatory in nature rather it was actuated and deed was finalized. The statement of Abhishek Sil reveals that this petitioner has arranged meeting with Sanjeev Hans in connection with his business tender and, therefore, *prima facie* the argument of petitioner that he never misused the position of Sanjeev Hans for getting any benefit *prima facie* not appears convincing.

34. Hence, it is difficult for this Court to believe at this stage that Rs.3.65 crores, which was paid in cash, as

alleged by ED was not proceed of crime.

35. Taking note of all such aforesaid facts broadly, it can not 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, 2002.

But,

As petitioner remained in custody for more than **eleven months** against maximum sentence of seven years i.e. since 18.10.2024, 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, therefore, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned District and Sessions Judge-cum-Special Judge (PMLA), Patna in connection with Special Trial (PMLA) Case No.10 of 2024 arising out of ECIR No. PTZO/04/2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 437(3) of the CrPC/under Section 480(3) of the BNSS'.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Sanjeet/-

U		T	