

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44683 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-136 Year-2016 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Ram Naresh Rai son of Late Gena Rai Village- Manua Ps- Sadar Dist-
Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through S.P Vigilance, Patna Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Bhardwaj
For the Vigilance : Mr. Arvind Kumar (Spl. PP)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S. B. PD. SINGH
ORAL ORDER

6 03-03-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The instant application for anticipatory bail has been filed by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Special Case 62 of 2016 arising out of Vigilance P.S. Case No. 136 of 2016 instituted for the offence punishable under Sections 13 (2) read with 13(I)(e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

3. As per allegation in the FIR, petitioner was a member of Panchayat Samiti, Manua Panchayat, Block and also he was Chairman of Manua PACS. During the period of his above engagement, he was getting a salary of RS. 1,500/- but his acquired property is disproportionate to his income. Allegedly, the amount which has been alleged to be



disproportionate is Rs. 46,22,230/-.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. Investigation has been carried out in most callous manner without verifying the entire details of the case. Calculation has been carried out by the Vigilance is not creditworthy. There is nothing to show that investigating agency has bother to verify the financial background of the parents of the petitioner or his in-laws.

5. Learned Spl. P.P. appearing on behalf of the Vigilance opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail and submitted that chargesheet has been submitted on 23.07.2019. Petitioner is the then Member of Panchayat Samiti, Manya Gram Panchayat, Hajipur Block and thereafter PACS Chairman of Manua Panchayat and he had amassed Rs. 50,12,378/-, which is disproportionate to his income. There is nothing to show the known source of income to clarify the disproportionate property.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the disproportionate property from unknown source of income, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner and, as such, his application for grant of anticipatory bail is rejected.



7. However, if the petitioner surrenders and prays for regular bail, the same may be considered by the court below on its own merit without being prejudiced by this order of rejection.

(S. B. Pd. Singh, J)

sushma/-

U			
---	--	--	--

