

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69897 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2025 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Vaishali

Arvind Thakur @ Arvind Kumar Thakur S/O Rameshwar Thakur R/O Vill.-
Chakaku, P.S.- Bhagwanpur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Awadhesh Kumar Chaudhary S/O Lakshman Chaudhary R/O Village-
Shambhupur Kowari, P.O- Asoi, P.S- Sarai, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Janardan Prasad Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-10-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2),
318(4) and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that that the accused persons being the Director,
Manager and Agent of Nirmal Vishwas Nidhi Ltd. Bank assured
him of returns on his investment, accordingly, the informant
started depositing Rs.700/- per day for two years and, as such,
deposited an amount of Rs.50,000/- but later came to know that
the accused persons have closed the Bank on 28.12.2024 and



fled away but still the agent kept collecting the installment till 30.12.2024.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, being the Manager of the Bank, has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that petitioner was given notice under Section 35 BNSS but then he did not respond as he was in Kolkata as the son-in-law of his sister had died.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that if the petitioner in pursuance of notice issued under Section 35 BNSS did not respond in that event the petitioner could have informed the Investigating Officer of the case about his predicament but then from perusal of the pleadings made in the anticipatory bail application, it does not appear probable that petitioner ever made any endeavour to inform the Investigating Officer of the case that he was preoccupied with some work at Kolkata. Learned A.P.P. further submits that such institutions are mushrooming in the State of Bihar and are cheating innocent investors of their hard earned money and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.



6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P. for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 21 of 2025, pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate-VI, Vaishali at Hajipur/Successor Court.

7. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

