

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69245 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-384 Year-2025 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

Chandan Kumar, Son of Rajendra Ram, Resident of Nagar Parishad Supaul,
Ward No.- 17, P.S.- Supaul, District - Supaul (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Patna

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Senior Advocate
		Mr. Bhagya Narayan Jha, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Choubey Jawahar, APP
For the Vigilance Deptt.	:	Mr. Anil Singh, Law Officer

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

6 03-12-2025 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner and

learned Law Officer appearing for Department of Vigilance,

State of Bihar.

2. The accused/petitioner seeks bail in connection
with Supaul P.S. Case No.384 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 7(a), 7(b) and 12 of the
Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 amended in 2018 (in
short 'P.C. Act').

3. The accused/petitioner is named in the FIR and is
in custody since 26.07.2025.

4. Allegation against petitioner is to accept Rs.



25,000/- as bribe, which was recovered from his pocket and also Rs.98,000/- from a trunk behind his sitting place.

5. Mr. P.N. Shahi, learned senior counsel appearing for petitioner submitted that from the facial perusal of FIR, the allegation of demand is not available against this petitioner as to attract the offence under Section 7 of the P.C. Act. It is pointed out that the cash, which was found in pocket of the petitioner was for payment of medical bills of ailing wife, who was admitted in private hospital of the city on the date of raid. It is pointed out by Mr. Shahi that in that sense the petitioner himself is the victim as his hard earned money of Rs. 25,000/- was seized out of alleged raid. For the rest of the recovery of said amount, it is submitted that same was recovered from the trunk of the office and merely on the basis of suspicion, as petitioner sitting arrangement was in front of the trunk, it was presumed that amount belongs to this petitioner. While concluding argument, it is submitted that investigation of this case is already completed, for which, charge-sheet has been submitted and, as such, there is no chance of tampering with the evidence. The petitioner is a



man of clean antecedent.

6. Arguing further, Mr. Shahi submitted that the seizure list also not appears to be supported by independent witnesses rather by the staffs of the same office and, therefore, the false implication out of office politics cannot be denied outrightly.

7. Mr. Anil Singh, learned Law Officer appearing for Department of Vigilance while opposing the prayer of bail submitted that petitioner was actively involved in illegal activities of receiving money as bribe. It is pointed out that entire recovery process was videographed by informant, who is B.D.O. Supaul.

8. In view of aforesaid factual submissions and by taking note of fact as except Rs.25,000/-, which claimed by petitioner as his personal money, the rest of the amount as recovered during raid *prima facie* not appears to be recovered from conscious physical possession of this petitioner, coupled with the fact that investigation of this case is already completed, where petitioner, being a man of clean antecedent, remains in custody since 26.07.2025,



accordingly, the petitioner, above-named, is directed to be released on bail furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned A.D.J-II, Bhagalpur in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No.384 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 437(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short ‘CrPC’)/under Section 480(3) of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (for short ‘BNSS’).

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Sanjeet/-

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

