

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2023 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Versus

- Opposite Party/s

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Jainendra Kumar Pushkar, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Parmeshwar Mehta, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, (law officer, Adv.)

3 25-02-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Special Case No. 6B of 2023 arising out of Vigilance P.S. Case No. 14 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under sections 7(a), 7(c), 7A and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is the second attempt of the petitioner to get the relief of anticipatory bail and his first prayer for the same relief was rejected by this Court vide order dated 21.06.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 84202/2023 and the fresh ground for renewing the prayer is the completion of the investigation and the submission



of a supplementary charge-sheet against him after granting him the benefit of the provisions of Section 41A of the Cr.P.C. Though, in light of the said benefit of police bail, the petitioner had no apprehension of arrest till that time, however, after submission of the charge-sheet, the learned trial court has taken cognizance of the alleged offences and issued summons against him, which were not within the knowledge of the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Vigilance Department submits that during the course of investigation several notices were sent to the petitioner to appear and provide his voice sample and finally on 16.01.2025 the investigating officer personally met the petitioner at his home and served the notice under section 41A of the Cr.P.C. asking him to give his voice sample but even then the petitioner deliberately refused to give voice samples. The petitioner's voice sample is required for matching the same with the alleged conversation which was recorded during the relevant period of time and the same is very material piece of evidence. So, the condition of the police bail was not complied with by the petitioner when the said notice was served upon him.

5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials. The petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail has already been rejected on merit. Though, after such rejection, the



petitioner was given the benefit of police bail by the Investigating Officer, as submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the Vigilance Department, the terms and conditions of the said police bail were not complied with by the petitioner. In this regard, a solemn affirmation has been made on affidavit, considering this aspect, this Court is not persuaded to take a liberal approach to the petitioner's prayer and also does not find any subsequent change in circumstances entitling him to the relief of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the instant application stands rejected.

6. The petitioner is directed to surrender before the trial court within twenty days from today. If he surrenders within the said period, it shall be open to the trial court to pass an appropriate order with regard to his custody or bail, and the rejection of the petitioner's prayer in the present application shall not affect the merit of any such prayer made before the trial court. Further, the present order shall not affect the right of the Vigilance Department to seek further interrogation of the petitioner in accordance with the provisions of law.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

annu/-

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

