

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33740 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-647 Year-2023 Thana- BANKA District- Banka

=====

Banshidhar Kumar Rao @ Bashidhar Kumar Rao S/o- Balram Prasad @
Banram Prasad Rao Resident Of Village- Majhgay, Ps- Rajoun, Dist- Banka
... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Vigilance Investigation Officer, Bhagalpur, Bihar
Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate
For the Vigilance : Mr. A. Singh, Advocate

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR
PANDEY**

ORAL ORDER

5 27-11-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Banka P.S. Case No. 647 of 2023, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the IPC.

3. As per the prosecution story, the petitioner is a
Panchayat Teacher. As per allegation, he secured job on the basis of
forged certificate. The certificate was verified and it was found to be
forged.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. He has further submitted that the authenticity and genuineness
of the certificate is still under investigation. The petitioner is a person
of clean antecedent.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Vigilance has



opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the certificate has already been verified from Jharkhand Academic Council, Ranchi and it was found that the certificate was forged. He has further submitted the petitioner has not resigned from the job within the amnesty period granted by the High Court in CWJC No. 15459 of 2014. Learned counsel has further submitted that on the similar ground, co-ordinate Bench has refused the prayer for anticipatory bail in another case in Cr. Misc. No. 47736 of 2024.

6. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, in my view, the petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

