

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17893 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-6 Year-2025 Thana- GARDANIBAG District- Patna

=====

Jitendra Kumar @ Jitendra Kumar Singh S/o Keshav Prasad Singh R/o
Village - Ganili, P.O - Madhodih, P.S - Tarapur, District – Munger

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

2 14-05-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Gardanibagh P.S. Case No. 6 of 2025 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2),
112(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 10 and 11
of Bihar Examination Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant
alleges that Chottu was apprehended, who disclosed that he was
a candidate in pursuance of the Advertisement No. 1 of 2023
issued for appointment of Constable, further in his place Shivam
appeared in the written examination with help of petitioner, who
took Rs. 5 lakh in lieu of the favour showered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that



petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case based on confessional statement of Chottu. It is next submitted that Chottu disclosed that in the exam, which was conducted for appointment of Constable, in his place Shivam appeared in connivance of the petitioner, who took an amount of Rs. 5 lakh for showering the said favour. It is reiterated and submitted that confessional statement of apprehended-accused in police custody does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that of late in the State of Bihar, occurrence of the nature as alleged has grown with impunity, as such investigation and interrogation of the petitioner is also required and investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

