

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29119 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-480 Year-2024 Thana- SUGAULI District- East Champaran

Rajkishor Singh S/o- Late Jagdish Singh Village- Mansi Ps- Mansi Dist-
Khagaria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Renu Kumari, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 19-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
APP for the State and perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in Sugauli P.S.
Case No. 480 of 2024, registered under Sections 61, 318(4),
338, 338(3), 217 and 248 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that the accusation
against the accused persons including the petitioner is of
committing fraud with an intention of deceiving common people
in the name of note doubling.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that
the allegation levelled against the petitioner is general and



omnibus in nature. The petitioner was posted as Sub Inspector of Police at Sugauli Police Station and he has been implicated in this case because of enmity with the informant who happens to be his superior Police Officer. It is next submitted that co-accused persons have not disclosed the name of the petitioner and on the alleged date of occurrence the petitioner was discharging his duty in the third night shift. The petitioner has got no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that other co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 18.03.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 15036 of 2025.

5. Learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is specific allegation against the petitioner along with other co-accused persons. It is further submitted that in paragraph nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the case diary, informant and other prosecution witnesses have fully supported the prosecution story and all witnesses have stated that holder of the mobile no. 9304978114 is also involved in the whole occurrence and during investigation, it transpired that the alleged mobile number belongs to the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.



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

7. The prayer is rejected. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender in the Court below and pray for regular bail. If any such application is filed, the Court below shall consider and dispose of the same on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

Rajorshi/-

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

