

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39128 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-279 Year-2016 Thana- BETTIAH CITY District- West
Champaran

=====

Pappu Kumar Singh @ Pappu Singh Late Triloki Singh Resident of Village-
Rajabhar, PS- Majhaulia, District- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Nilaykant Mishra, Chief Manager, SBI, Bettiah Branch, West Champaran
R/o Shankar Sadan, Balkishunganj, Kabutari Gali, PS- Guljarbagh, Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Adv.
Mr. Sharad Kumar Verma, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

5 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 Bettiah Town P.S. Case No. 279 of 2016
registered for offence under Sections 409 and 420 of the I.P.C.

3. As per prosecution case, the allegation against the
petitioner is that the petitioner has taken a car loan of Rs.
6,25,000/- from the Bettiah branch of S.B.I. but, due to non-
repayment of the loan amount, the loan account was declared
NPA. It is further alleged that the Informant bank issued a letter
to the petitioner for producing the said purchased car for survey
but, the same was not produced by the petitioner and it appears
that the alleged car has been sold by the petitioner without



permission of the bank.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks adjournment, which is not possible as a number of adjournments have already been given.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State Bank of India submits that the petitioner has moved with a prayer for anticipatory bail after nine years of the occurrence. He further submits that the petitioner sold the hypothecated car and is neither paying the loan amount nor has complied with the order dated 15.10.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, directing the petitioner to file supplementary affidavit, disclosing the whereabouts of the alleged car and also for taking instruction as with regard to the payment of the due amount but, the aforesaid order dated 15.10.2025 has not been complied as yet.

6. Considering the aforesaid 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.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

rishi/-

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



