

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25539 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2026 Thana- KUCHAIKOTE District- Gopalganj

Meena Kumari @ Meena Devi W/O Devendra Pandey Resident of Village-
Machawa, P.S.- Kateya, Distt- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Deputy Superintendent of Police-cum-Asst. Investigating Officer,
Vigilance Investigation Bureau Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vyas Kumar Mishra, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Madan Kumar, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

4 15-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P
for the State and learned counsel for the Vigilance.

2. The petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with
Kuchaikote P.S. Case No. 36 of 2026 lodged on 20.01.2026, for
the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 &
120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Gopalganj.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against
the present petitioner and unknown persons. The prosecution
case in brief is that in light of order passed in C.W.J.C. No.
15459 of 2014, a vigilance case has been registered and the
documents of the candidates/teacher employees were verified



district wise and in course of the verification, the documents of Prakhanda Shiksha (the present petitioner) posted at Upgraded Middle School, Sukhdeo Patti, Block Kuchaikote, Gopalganj were examined and from the report and verification obtained from the institution, it has come that the forged documents relating to marksheets had been submitted by the petitioner and on that basis, the present FIR has been lodged.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. He submits that in the FIR, it has been alleged that the petitioner has passed her intermediate in Second division, but in the form, she has shown herself as First division pass and only due to this reason, she was selected. Counsel submits that the allegation levelled against the petitioner is absolutely wrong as the petitioner is submitting Annexure-P/2 in which her marks in the intermediate is 444 out of 900, whereas, in the FIR, the marks have been shown as 669 out of 900. He submits that the petitioner has become scapegoat of a conspiracy and she is completely innocent. He further submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the Vigilance vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that counter



affidavit has been filed. In the counter affidavit, the original form which the petitioner has filed for selection has annexed as Annexure-A. The correspondence with Jharkhand Academic Council, Ranchi and the marks provided by the Jharkhand Intermediate Education Council have been attached.

6. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

7. There are two application forms placed before this Court. Firstly, the application form which is Annexure-P/2, produced before this Court by the petitioner and secondly, the application form which is Annexure-A, produced before this Court by the Vigilance.

8. Upon perusal of these two application forms, it transpires to this Court that the form which has been produced by the petitioner is not indicating that the said employment was for which Prakhanda/Panchayat/Nagar Nikay, whereas, in the original form produced by the Vigilance, it has been shown that the said employment was for a definite Prakhanda/Panchayat/Nagar Nikay. The signatures of D.P.O as well as the B.D.O is also present in the form produced by the Vigilance, whereas, the form produced by the petitioner is completely lacking of the same. In this situation, this Court



cannot rely on the application form produced by the petitioner before this Hon’ble Court and this Court is very much surprised that the petitioner even after filing of the criminal case, has tried to mislead this Court.

9. As such, in the present facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

