

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33493 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-566 Year-2024 Thana- DEHRI TOWN District- Rohtas

Khushi Kumari Wife of Sri Sunil Kumar Resident of E-94, PC Colony  
Kankarbagh, P.S.- Kankarbagh, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Additional Chief Secretary, The Vigilance Dept. Govt. of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                            |
|--------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr. Akash Keshav, Advocate |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, APP    |
| For the Vigilance        | : | Mr. Anil Singh, Advocate   |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      21-05-2025                      Heard Mr. Akash Keshan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Anil Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State as well as learned counsel for the Vigilance Department.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in connection with Dehri Town P.S. Case No. 566 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 12.08.2024 for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2) and 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 7(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

3. According to prosecution case, the informant and other persons submitted their T.A. Bill for the work they did but only informant's said Bill was not passed and for passing the said accused person, namely, Mr. Tushar Ghosh demanded 10% T.A.



of Bill as bribe.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears from the F.I.R. that Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act is not attracted against the petitioner and apart from that it also appears from the F.I.R. that the husband of the petitioner, namely, Sunil Kumar had transferred Rs. 26,00/- in the bank account of the petitioner and the on the basis of that the petitioner has been implicated in this case. He further submits that co-accused person, namely, Mr. Tushar Ghosh had also deposited the 10% of the total bill amount in the account of the petitioner. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R and the petitioner has been made accused merely on the ground that she is wife of the co-accused person, namely, Sunil Kumar.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor as well as learned counsel for the Vigilance Department has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner also involved in the present crime in question.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, the petitioner



has clean antecedent and the petitioner has been made accused merely on the ground that she is wife of the co-accused person, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Special Judge Vigilance, Patna in connection with Dehri Town P.S. Case No. 566 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/482(2) of the B.N.S.S., 2023 and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at



any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

**(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)**

Jyoti Kumari/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

