

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.46173 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-132 Year-2025 Thana- TARAIYA District- Saran

Manoj Mahto S/o Ramjit Mahato R/o Village- Gopalpur, P.S.- Basantpur  
(Lakari Naviganj), District- Siwan

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Brij Kishor Mishra, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sumiran Rai, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH  
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

4      07-10-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Taraiya  
P.S. Case No. 132 of 2025 instituted for the offences under  
Sections 316(2), 318(4), 303(2), 316(5), 61(2) of the Bharatiya  
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

3. The prosecution case, in short, is that Guriya  
Kumari, along with her husband Sanoj Mahto, brother-in-law  
Manoj Mahto, and driver Raju Paswan, misappropriated  
₹15,80,000 meant for ATM cash loading by falsely reporting a  
robbery. Later, ₹15,60,000 was allegedly recovered from the  
house of Manoj Mahto's in-laws.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that



petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that general and omnibus allegation has been made against the petitioner. No specific overt act is alleged against the petitioner. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that as per the material available in the case diary, the active role in misappropriating the said amount is attributed to co-accused Guriya Kumari. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner is not the employee of the informant's company and, as a matter of fact, the co-accused Guriya Kumari, who is the employee of the informant's company, did not load the holiday fund in the ATM but gave the same to the petitioner for keeping safely and hence, it is clear that the petitioner has no role to play in the alleged misappropriation of fund. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 17.05.2025 and has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner stating that the misappropriated sum of Rs. 15,60,000/- has been recovered at the instance of the petitioner from the house of his in-laws and, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve to be released on



bail.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as also the fact that misappropriated sum has been recovered from the house of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner is rejected.

8. Learned Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same without any undue delay and unnecessary adjournments.

9. However, liberty is given to the petitioner to renew his prayer for grant of bail if the trial is not concluded within the next five months from today.

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

Alok Verma/-

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

