

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4384 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-420 Year-2025 Thana- DINARA District- Rohtas

Kulwanti Devi W/o- Late Sriman Narayan Singh Village- Mirzapur PS-
Dinara District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Manoj Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 17-02-2026 Heard Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, learned counsel
appearing on behalf of the petitioner and Mr. Manoj Kumar,
learned APP appearing on behalf of the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends her arrest in connection
with Dinara P.S. Case No. 420 of 2025 registered under Sections
318(4),338,336(3),316(2), of BNS.

3. As per the allegation made in the FIR, during the
financial year 2021–22, the petitioner allegedly obtained
benefits under Pradhan Mantri Awaas Yojana – Gramin (PMAY-
Gramin) by falsely declaring that she owned no *pucca* house,
despite already having two such houses, and received Rs.
90,000/-, despite recovery notices and orders in Second Appeal
No.168 of 2024, she has failed to refund the said amount.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the



petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and she has falsely been implicated in the present case. The petitioner has not committed any forgery in relation to the Government funds. The measurement book reveals that the petitioner constructed the house strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Indira Awas Yojna, and after due verification, a completion report was also submitted by the executive agency. The allegation that the petitioner constructed the house in an illegal manner and misappropriated a sum of Rs. 90,000/- of Government funds is not supported by any evidence. It is further submitted that the petitioner's son constructed his own house on a separate piece of land. The petitioner has clean antecedent. On these grounds, the petitioner seeks to be released on pre-arrest bail.

5. Learned APP for the State vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of pre-arrest bail.

6. Having considered the rival submissions made on behalf of the parties, as well, having perused the allegation made in the FIR and the fact that misappropriation of sum of Rs. 90,000/- of Government funds is not supported by any evidence, I am of the opinion that the petitioner, having clean antecedent, has, *prima facie*, made out a case to be released on



pre-arrest bail.

7. The learned District Court is directed to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned District Court within a period of four weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned District Court where the case is pending/ in connection with Dinara P.S. Case No. 420 of 2025, subject to the condition as laid down under Section 482 of the BNSS//438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

8. The learned District Court is directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner, as stated in paragraph no. 3 of the bail application. If any other case is pending against the petitioner, as what has been stated in paragraph no. 3, this order will lose its force automatically.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

Ashishsingh/-

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

