IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45603 of 2025
Arising Out of PS. Case No.-187 Year-2025 Thana- KOTWALI District- Patna

==

Mukesh Kumar Rajak son of Rajkapur Rajak Village- Kurmi tola PS -Chowk patna City Dhaulpura, Dist- Patna, Bihar

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Harsh Vardhan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar, A.P.P.
Mr. LL Pandey, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 03-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the State and the informant.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under sections 318(2) and 316(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. As per the prosecution case, petitioner, while posted as Customer Service Associate in Patna regional office of Central Bank of India, dishonestly processed RFA payment for about 13 officials in Zonal Audit office despite of them availing house rent allowance. Petitioner manipulated the system by self preparing vouchers and transferring funds to the accounts linked to his family members by using other officers' password and computers of informant's office at Patna. It is further alleged that the petitioner confessed his guilty and

returned Rs.26 lacs to the bank. After investigation, it was found that the petitioner misappropriated Rs.1,16,70,061/- of the bank.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was merely Customer Service Associate and his duty was to prepare the data and send it to the superior officials of the bank. Besides this, from perusal of the FIR itself, it is clear that fund were transferred from the computer of other officials which was opened by the bio-metrics (thumb) of the concerned officer of the bank, as such, allegation of transfer of fund by petitioner using computer system of other officials appears to be improbable. No document has been produced to support the alleged fraud amounting to Rs.1,16,70,061/. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the State and the informant (bank) oppose the prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the bank submits that the petitioner is named in the FIR with specific allegation that he misappropriated huge amount of money of the bank in the name of Rent Free Accommodation.

6. Considering the fact that petitioner has been alleged to have misappropriated Rs.1,16,70,061/- of the bank, his prayer

for bail is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Shashi

U		T	