

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13503 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-347 Year-2023 Thana- CHERIYA BARIYARPUR District-
Begusarai

=====

Pankaj Kumar Bharti S/O Sundeshwar Ram R/O village- Mukundpur Bhath,
P.S.- Jandaha, District-Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Sagar Kumar Singh Son of- Ashok Prasad Singh Village and post- Bhaddi,
P.S.- Patarghat, Saharsa

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajeev Ranjan

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Uday Chand Prasad

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

7 11-02-2026 1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with
Cheria Bariyarpur P.S. Case No. 347 of 2023 dated 01.12.2023
registered for the offence under Section 406, 420 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the F.I.R. allegation against the petitioner is that the
petitioner being an employee of the Muthooth Microfinance
Company Ltd. misappropriated Rs. 3,76,445/- of 268 customers
of closing and EMI collected by him under the Branch of
Manjhaul Area.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is
innocent and he has not committed any offence in the manner
alleged. The petitioner is working at Garhpura Branch Office



under Samastipur Divisional Office and he was not authorized to collect the loan amount of customers under Manjhaul Branch. The fact of the matter is that loans were distributed by the brother-in-law of the informant by using fake Aadhaar and Voter Cards and informant orally said to the petitioner for collection of distributed amount of customers under Manjhaul Branch. The petitioner has not received any amount from the customers of Muthooth Microfinance Company Ltd. under Manjhaul Branch. The informant has not mentioned the name and address of any customer who has claimed against the petitioner. The informant has not produced any kind of receiving of said amount by the petitioner from any customer under Manjhaul Branch.

5. Regard being had to the submissions made by the parties, taking into consideration the fact that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Manjhaul has taken note of the fact that witnesses in paragraph nos. 2, 6 & 7 in verbatim have supported the statement made in the F.I.R. and in paragraph no. 19 i.e. supervision note it has come that petitioner was employed by the said company for providing loan to rural women group and collecting EMI and closing loan account after receiving the same but instead of depositing the collect amount in the company the petitioner fled away with it, accordingly, taking



into consideration the nature of allegation and prima facie finding arrived at by learned Additional Sessions Judge, I do not find any reason to differ with it, accordingly this application for grant of anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

