

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.12393 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-247 Year-2020 Thana- KADAMKUAN District- Patna

Md. Tabrez Alam @ Tabrez Alam, S/o Salim @ Salim Ansari, R/o Village-
Chirudih, P.S- Muffasil Dumka, District- Dumka, Jharkhand

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Dr. Mrityunjaya Kr. Gautam, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PARTHA SARTHY
ORAL ORDER

5 13-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has preferred this application for grant of regular bail in connection with Kadamkuan P.S. Case no.247 of 2020 registered under sections 420 and 406 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per the prosecution case, the informant states that a total of Rs.1,01,898/- was illegally deducted from his savings bank account in the bank. As such the F.I.R.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. The F.I.R. was registered against unknown. The false implication of the petitioner was for the reason that the amount deducted from the informant's bank account through Paytm was transferred to five different accounts, one of which belongs to the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner had gone to Dadra and Nagar



Haveli for search of job as a labourer in thread manufacturing company where the contractor had got an account opened in his name. The petitioner has no control over the said account. No material has transpired in course of investigation to show that the petitioner is the beneficiary of the amount deducted from the account of the informant. The petitioner is in custody since 18.8.2025 and charge-sheet has been submitted in the case.

5. The application for bail is opposed by learned A.P.P. for the State.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the allegations in the F.I.R., the material that has transpired in course of investigation including the fact that out of the total amount of Rs.1,01,898/- which was transferred to five different accounts, one of the account was in the name of the petitioner, the Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and the application is rejected.

7. Liberty is granted to the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after completing one year in custody and after framing of charge, whichever is later.

(Partha Sarthy, J)

avinash/-

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

