

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33107 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-363 Year-2022 Thana- RAMGARH District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Ramesh Kumar Yadav S/O Ramakant Yadav R/O Village- Jhuguri, P.S.-
Sahabganj, District- Chandauli, U.P. (Ex. Branch Manager of Prayant Micro
Finance Limited Company, Branch Ramgarh).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Bir Bahadur Kumar S/O Ramdat Prasad Singh R/O Village- Indrapur, P.S.-
Dhansoi, Distt.- Buxar, Posted as Deputy Regional Manager (D.R.M.) of
Prayant Micro Finance Company Branch Ramgarh.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Tribhuwan Narayan, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Madhura Nand Jha, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

4 02-12-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Ramgarh P.S. Case No. 363 of 2022 registered for offence under Sections 406, 409, 420, 504, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. The present F.I.R. has been lodged on the basis of the complaint petition made by Bir Bahadur Kumar, the Deputy Divisional Manager of Prayatn Micro Finance Limited Company, Branch Ramgarh, Kaimur and other accused persons are the office holders of that finance company.



4. As per allegation, the petitioner and other co-accused persons received the installments of the loan amount but, did not deposit the same in the bank account of the deposit holders.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that it is not the function of the petitioner to deposit or collect the installments of the loan amount rather, being a Branch Manager, the managerial affairs are assigned upon the petitioner.

6. On the other hand, Mr. J.N. Thakur, learned APP for the State, has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner was also involved in the alleged occurrence according to statements of the deposit holders. By drawing the attention of this Court towards paragraph nos. 15 and 16 of the case diary, the learned APP for the State has submitted that the account holders have stated that they deposited the installments of the loan amount which was also entered in their pass-book but, they came to know that the amount was not deposited in their loan account.

7. The petitioner, being the Manager of the Branch, is duty bound to keep vigil on all the affairs of the bank. The



investigation is still continuing.

8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case and also keeping in view the allegation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant him the privilege of anticipatory bail, which is hereby rejected.

9. If the petitioner surrenders before the court below and prays for regular bail, the same would be considered by the court below in accordance with law without being prejudiced by this order.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

rishi/-

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

