IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19135 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-172 Year-2023 Thana- JURAWANPUR District- Vaishali

==

Abhishek Kumar Son of Vimal Prasad Resident of village East Lohanipur, J.P.S. Lane Police Station - Kadamkuan, District - Patna, Presently posted as Assistant Manager, Bihar Gramin Bank, Barah Branch, at P.S.- Biharsharif, District - Nalanda.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Uttar Gramin Bank, Jurabanpur Branch, P.S.- Jurabanpur, Dist.- Vaishali Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vidyapati, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Satyendra Prasad, APP
For the Bank	:	Dr. Anand Kumar, Advocate Mr. Rajan Prakash, Advocate Mr. Rahul Bhaskar, Advocate

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

3 06-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the Bank.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, apprehending his arrest, in connection with Jurawanpur P.S. Case No. 172 of 2023 dated 21.11.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 406 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per allegation, the petitioner and other co-accused have illegally withdrawn Rs. 46,499/- from two accounts held by two dead customers.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner is a Dealing Assistant in Uttar Gramin Bank and his only job was to enter the particulars in the computer and forward it to the Bank Manager for verification of the signature and identity. He further submits that in the departmental proceeding against co-accused/Radha Prasad Ram, who was a Bank Manager, he has admitted that he has committed mistake in verification of the signature and identity. He also submits that as per circular of the Bank, the Bank Manager is required to verify the signature/thumb impression and identity of the person.

5. It is also stated in paragraph no. 2 of the bail petition that the petitioner has not moved this Court earlier either for anticipatory bail or regular one in the instant case.

6. It has further been stated in paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent.

7. However, learned APP for the State and learned counsel for the Bank vehemently oppose the prayer of the Petitioner for bail submitting that the petitioner is a Dealing Assistant and his duty was to verify the signature/thumb impression and identify of the account holder and computer is

always available with him for such verification and without his verification, the file does not proceed to Bank Manager. So the offence has been committed not only by the Bank Manger, but also with the connivance of the present petitioner and hence, he does not deserve bail.

8. I considered the submissions advanced by the parties and perused the material on record.

9. I find that this fraud has been committed in the banking system and if such type of offence is committed, the banking system will collapse. Hence, it is serious in nature and without the connivance of the Dealing Assistant, no offence can be committed.

10. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

shoaib/-

U		T	