

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39752 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-494 Year-2024 Thana- MOHANIYA District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Srikant Kumar Gupta S/O Late Ramanand Sagar Resident of Village- Belav,
PS- Bhabhua, Distt-Kaimur. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rekha Kuwar W/O Late Ramesgwar Prasad Gupta R/O Village- Barhuli,
PS-MOhania, Distt-Kaimur
- Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Y.C. Verma, Sr. Advocate Mrs. Kiran Kumari Sharma, Advocate
For the State	:	Ms. Gauri Shankar Gupta, APP
For the Informant	:	Mr. Parwaj Khan, Advocate

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

ORAL ORDER

709-12-2025

Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner as well as
informant and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Mohania P.S. Case No. 494 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 352, 351(2), 351(3) of the BNS.

3. As per the FIR, the informant states that about seven years ago, the petitioner had made two fixed policies for her in R.B.-A.S. Corporation Limited Company, one for ₹5,00,000 and another for ₹2,00,000. After the maturity of the policies, when she asked the petitioner to withdraw and return the money, he allegedly started misleading her and threatening to kill her. The informant further alleges that the petitioner committed fraud with her and on 10.03.2017, transferred ₹7,39,000 from her bank account to his own



account without her knowledge.

4. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner is neither an agent of any policy or insurance company nor has he obtained any policy for the complainant. His further submission is that he has not transferred complainant's money in his bank account, as alleged in the FIR.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the informant as well as State opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the witnesses in paragraph no. 2, 3 and 4 of the case diary have supported the prosecution case. From perusal of paragraph no. 12 and 16 of the case diary, it appears that money has been transferred into the bank account of the petitioner.

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

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

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

