

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17768 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-613 Year-2024 Thana- KATIHAR NAGAR District- Katihar

Dev Raj @ Deoraj S/o Mahendra Sah R/o Kursela Basti, Ward no 14, PS-
Kursela, Distt- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 07-05-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.
- 2.** The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Nagar Katihar PS Case No. 613 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3) and 340(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Section 10 of Examination Act.
- 3.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that Chetan was caught giving exam in place of Abhishek in the examination being conducted for appointment as Constable in Middle School Mirchai Bari Katihar on 28-8-2024.
- 4.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant alleges that Chetan was caught in place of Abhishek



giving examination. It is next submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR.

5. At this stage, learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Rabindra Kumar, vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that during the course of investigation, the apprehended accused (Chetan) disclosed the name of the petitioner that he had assured of giving photostat answer papers to Chetan at exam centre for Rs. 50,000/-, it is next submitted that of late in the State of Bihar such occurrences are taking place with impunity. It is also submitted that this adversely impact the society as meritorious students are ousted from consideration and willy candidates taking help of such persons qualify in the exam. It is further submitted that investigation and interrogation in the case is required.

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	
---	--	---	--

