

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74836 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-144 Year-2025 Thana- JOGAPATTI District- West Champaran

Afroj Siddiki @ Mohammad Afroz Siddique S/o- Late Islam Miyan Resident
of Vill- Machchhargawan, Jamuniya, P.S.-Yogapatti, Dist- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. The Central Bank of India, through its Regional Head, Central Bank of India, Motihari Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP
For the Bank	:	Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 18-11-2025 Heard Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the Bank as well as Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Yogapatti P.S. Case No. 144 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 29.03.2025 for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 409 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. According to prosecution case, the petitioner has transferred total Rs. 29,79,000/- from accounts of the customers of the Bank and withdrew the same.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner runs a C.S.P. at Jamuniya under Central Bank of India, Fatehpur Machhargawn Branch. As per the allegation in the F.I.R, he has not deposited Rs. 16,95,500/- in the accounts of the customers. After investigation it was discovered that the petitioner has also cheated 29 other customers. The petitioner has received Rs. 7,59,000/- in cash from 10 customers and he did not deposited the same in their accounts. Altogether, the petitioner has embezzled Rs. 29,79,000/- from the accounts of the customers and transferred the same in his account and withdrew the same.

5. Yesterday when the matter was taken up, the Court has asked the learned counsel for the petitioner that whether the petitioner is ready to deposit the amount in question to the Bank or not? Today when the matter was called out, learned counsel for the petitioner outrightly submits on the basis of instructions that the petitioner is not ready to pay the amount in question and he is ready to face the trial.

6. The learned counsel for the Bank as well as learned Additional Public Prosecutor have vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that it appears from the documents which was annexed with the F.I.R which suggest



that the petitioner has embezzled Rs. 29,79,000/- from the customers of the Bank.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Yogapatti P.S. Case No. 144 of 2025 pending in the court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bettiah, West Champaran.

8. Prayer is refused.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Vanisha/-

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

