

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.63623 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-158 Year-2015 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

Ramesh Kumar S/o Vishnudayal Mahto Resident Of Village- Indarwa, Ps-
Sonbarsa, Dist- Sitamarhi, posted as a Rural Housing Assistant in Kuari
Madan Gram Panchayat of Majorganj Block

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Majorganj P. S. Case No.158 of 2015 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 420, 468 and 34 of the
Indian Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that petitioner, a Rural Housing Assistant
submitted a list of 30 beneficiaries, who were to be provided
benefits under Chief Minister's Housing Renovation Scheme,
thereafter the petitioner submitted photographs of houses of 20
beneficiaries when informant along with Indira Aawas



Supervisor inspected the site, the petitioner could not even identify the houses and it was found that out of 20 beneficiaries, only 02 beneficiaries were entitled for the benefits.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that during the period of investigation, the petitioner was given notice under 41(A) of Cr.P.C., but subsequently the police after investigation found the case to be true under Section 409 of the I.P.C. also, as such, the petitioner apprehends his arrest.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that the case is of the Year 2015 and from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it manifests that petitioner a Rural Housing Assistant committed forgery by submitting name of such beneficiaries, who were not entitled for the house under the Chief Minister's Housing Renovation Scheme, which amply demonstrates that such misdemeanor was committed by the petitioner for ulterior reason. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail
stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

