

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.71048 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2023 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Nawada

=====

Pankaj Kumar S/O Umesh Prasad Resident of Village- Hussaina, P.S.-
Sermera, Distt.- Nalanda, presently residing at Village- Gonawan, P.S-
Nawada Nagar, Distt.- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-11-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and
Sections 66, 66B, 66C and 66D of the I.T. Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the
informant alleges that two months before, Mukesh and others
whose mobile no.7091431025 came to her village and requested
the villagers to make labour card as they will be given Rs.5500/-
per month by the government and also introduced them to Aman
and Jitendra. Further, 30-40 villagers gave their Aadhar Card,



photo and their thumb impression, thereafter they were informed that their labour card will be issued. Further, 15.09.2023, the villagers received a notice that their account has been opened in India Post Payment Bank in which money related to cyber crime is being deposited. Accordingly, the informant and other villagers met Aman, who runs a mobile shop informing about the occurrence when they were abused. Further, alleges that Manager of the Bank on enquiry informed that the account has been opened based on their Aadhar card, photo and thumb impression.

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 petitioner is posted as Assistant Manager, India Post Payment Bank. It is also submitted that no doubt, account were opened in the bank, but then, the same were opened based on the Aadhar Card, photo and thumb impression of the account holders. It is also submitted that money relating to cyber crime was being deposited in the aforesaid account and when the same came to the notice of the bank, the account holders were issued notice in pursuance whereof, the instant FIR came to be instituted. It is also submitted that petitioner worked as Assistant Manager in



the bank on contractual basis and had opened 12 accounts based on the documents submitted. It is further submitted that no doubt, the accounts were used for crediting amount relating to cyber offences, but then, petitioner was not involved, nor from his ID any money was withdrawn.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that case is under investigation and petitioner is not a permanent employee of the bank rather a contractual employee and if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on anticipatory bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Sri Priyanka Kumari, the learned J.M., 1st Class, Nawada in connection with Cyber P. S. Case No.45 of 2023, subject to the conditions laid down under



Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. with a further condition that one of the bailors of the petitioner shall be his father, namely, Umesh Prasad.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. It is further made clear that if charge-sheet is submitted connecting the petitioner with offence, in that event, the present anticipatory bail order shall loose its effect.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

