

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4709 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-450 Year-2017 Thana- LAKHISARAI District- Lakhisarai

Niranjan Kumar Son of Ghanshyam Verma Resident of Village -Lakhna , PO-  
Gopalpur PS And District Jamui then I.T Supervisor, District Welfare Office ,  
Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ram Ikbal Ram District Welfare Officer, Lakhisarai, Village - Ekbari, P.O. -  
Ekbari, P.S. - Sahaar, District - Bhojpur (Ara)

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                          |   |                        |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s     | : | Mr.Rabi Bhushan, Adv.  |
| For the Opposite Party/s | : | Mrs. Renu Kumari, Adv. |
| For the Informant        | : | Mr. Shive Kumar, Adv.  |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH  
MISHRA**

ORAL ORDER

5      14-07-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mrs.  
  
Renu Kumari, learned APP for the State as also learned counsel  
  
for the Informant. Perused the case diary.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with  
  
Lakhisarai P.S. Case No. 450 of 2017 instituted for the offences  
  
under Sections 467, 468, 406, 409, 470, 471 of the Indian Penal  
  
Code.

3. As per prosecution case, the petitioner has  
  
deliberately obtained fake application forms and fraudulently  
  
embezzled government money of Rs. 7,63,300/- in the name of  
  
the bank account of a fake educational institution for the



purpose of benefiting some private person under the fraud of committing forgery.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged against him and has falsely been implicated in the present case due to highhandedness of the superior authorities. The petitioner is neither a passing authority nor a depositing authority. There is no specific or direct allegation of any overt act against the petitioner rather the same is general and omnibus in nature and, has falsely implicated in the present case only on the basis of suspicion. He further submits that nothing incriminating/alleged amount has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He further submits that in course of investigation, it has come to light that the alleged amount was not deposited in the bank account of the petitioner rather the same was deposited in the bank account of one Neha Kumari and Gaurav Kumar with whom the petitioner has no concern at all. In course of investigation, not an iota of evidence has come against the petitioner showing his complicity in the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and is languishing in judicial custody since 11.09.2024 without any rhymes or reason.



5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State and Informant have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submits that the Investigating Officer, after completion of investigation, has submitted charge-sheet against the petitioner for offence under Sections 467, 468, 406, 409, 470, 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

6. Learned counsel for the Informant has filed counter affidavit in the matter, Paragraph nos. 6 & 7 whereof reads as follows:-

*“6. That the office of District Welfare had 5 scholarship forms were rejected. The Concerned Vikash Mitra had submitted report that 5 students were not students. They were not found on the address mentioned in the scholarship forms but the petitioner had tampered the aforesaid report of Vikash Mitra by cutting word not and added in the payment list.*

*7. That the petitioner had also tampered the Account Number mentioned in the scholarships form of 14 students and got payment of the scholarship amount in different account.”*

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner,



above named, is rejected with a direction to the court below to expedite the trial and conclude the same expeditiously preferably within a period of six months from today. If the trial is not concluded within the period of six months as stated above, the petitioner will be at liberty to renew his prayer before the court below..

**(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)**

rishi/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

