IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4668 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-70 Year-2014 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

==

Ranjit Kumar S/o- Late Devendra Prasad @ Devendra Prasad Singh R/v- Dhanuki Mor, Gaga Setu Road Po- Pahari Ps- Agam Kunwa, Patna

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Satish Kumar Sinha
Mr.Ashok Kumar Sinha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Yogendra Kumar

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA

ORAL ORDER

3 28-04-2026 1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Madhepura P.S. Case No. 70 of 2014 dated 08.02.2014 registered under section 467, 468, 469, 471, 420, 406, 409 & 120B / 34 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the first information report on 14.02.2012, Rs. 3,00,000/- was withdrawn from the account of Smt. Nutan Devi bearing A/C No. 1008001010004376 through cheque encashed by Manoj Kumar illegally. Further, on 19.12.2012 Rs. 2,00,000/- was credited in the same account through cheque by one Bhushan Rajak which was withdrawn by him on different dates in the month of September, 2013. This embezzlement came to the knowledge of the bank authorities

during internal audit leading to registration of F.I.R. bearing Madhepura P.S. Case No. 70 of 2014 for the offence under Sections 467, 468, 469, 471, 420, 406, 409 & 120B/34 of the I.P.C.

4. Mr. Satish Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not named in the F.I.R. and during course of investigation his name has transpired on the ground that petitioner was working in the concerned Branch and he was responsible for passing cheque of Rs. 2,00,000/- presented by Bhushan Rajak. He further submits that cash was not withdrawn rather Rs. 2,00,000/- was transferred from the account of Nutan Devi to the account of the co-accused / Bhushan Rajak. He has been made accused due to mistake of fact. During course of investigation it came to light that amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- was withdrawn by Manoj Kumar through cheque putting forged signature of the account holder Nutan Devi and the said cheque was passed by the Branch Manager C.R.C. Krishnan and payment was made by the Bank employee Janardhan Yadav and cheque of Rs. 2,00,000/- was deposited in the bank account of Bhushan Rajak and entry of the cheque was made by Aman Kumar and only signature was passed by Ranjit Kumar (petitioner) but when Bhushan Rajak came to know

about the embezzlement, he returned Rs. 2,94,000/- and Rs. 6,000/- with interest to the bank. As per paragraph no. 9 of the case diary amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- has been deposited in the account of the account holder Nutan Devi by Bhushan Rajak. The money was withdrawn from the account in question by Manoj Kumar and Bhushan Rajak and the petitioner is not the beneficiary of the said illegal withdrawal. Moreover, the petitoner has been dismissed from Bank service and has challenged the dismissal order by filing writ petition before this Court bearing C.W.J.C. No. 10694 of 2015 which is pending adjudication. The Branch Manager of the Bank has been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 03.09.2015 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 657 of 2015 (Annexure-P/2). The petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. Mr. Yogendra Kumar, learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner is actively involved in the alleged offence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, perused the materials on record including the impugned order and the case diary. In paragraph no. 70 of the case diary the Superintendent of Police, Madhepura in his supervision note has found the case true against the petitioner. From perusal of

paragraph no. 155 of the case diary it is evident that warrant of arrest has already been issued against the petitioner. After twelve years of the lodging of the F.I.R. in the year 2014 the present anticipatory bail application has been filed without explaining the reasons for delay. There is no parity between the case of the Branch Manager Choudhary Ranvijay Krishnan and the petitioner inasmuch as the petitioner was responsible for passing forged signature of Bhushan Rajak, who withdrew the amount in question.

7. Taking into consideration the nature of allegation and involvement of the petitioner in the case who is a Class- II Officer, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

U		T	