

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8107 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-180 Year-2024 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Patna

Mamta Kumari D/o- Surendra Saw R/vill- Dilhuri, P.S.- Haspura, Distt-
Aurangabad

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rahul Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Satya Nand Shukla, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 01-04-2026 Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and
Learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Cyber P.S. Case No.180 of 2024 lodged on 01.03.2024, for the offences punishable under Sections 379, 406, 201, 34 and 66(D) of the I.T. Act, 2000.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against two named accused persons including the present petitioner with allegation that total transaction of Rs.12,16,000/- was fraudulently withdrawn and transferred from the informant and his father bank account.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel also submits that the petitioner is basically met at the house of



informant and only with a view to teach lesson for not demanding money, the present case has been lodged. He further submits that notice under Section 41 of the Cr.P.C. has not been issued to the petitioner.

5. Counsel submits that the petitioner is a lady and her criminal antecedent is clean and ready to fulfill all the conditions whatsoever shall be imposed upon her. He further submits that petitioner is living at the house of the informant for more than one year and getting salary of Rs.9000/- per month. The outstanding amount of Rs.30,000/- which petitioner was demanding, but inspite of providing money, she has been falsely implicated in the present case.

6. Counsel further submits that on previous occasion, case diary has been called for.

7. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the Trial Court at the time of rejecting the bail, has categorically discussed the contents which has been extracted in the case diary during investigation by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Cyber Branch. In the investigation, it has come that Rs.8,47,000/- from the bank of SBI and Rs.3,69,000/- from the bank of ICICI have been transacted.



8. Counsel further submits that in paragraph 53 of the case diary, there is categorical statement recorded by the investigation team that how the present petitioner involved in transaction of money with the help of one Sandeep Kumar and her sister, namely, Jyoti Kumari. It has been found by the I.O. that the petitioner is a sole and main accused.

9. In the present facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, therefore the bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Prakashmani/-

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

