IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22209 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010310212026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1904 Year-2025 Thana- PHULWARISHARIF District- Patna

==========

1. Priyanka Kumari W/o Arun Kumar R/o vill - Ranipur, ward no. 27, P.S. and P.O.- Phulwari Sharif, Dist.- Patna
2. Arun Kumar S/o Late Shambhu Narayan Singh R/o vill - Ranipur, ward no. 27, P.S. and P.O.- Phulwari Sharif, Dist.- Patna

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Branch Manager, Indian Bank Phulwarishariff Branch, Patna through the S.H.O., Phulwarishariff Police Station, Patna

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Pulkit Ranjan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Rahil firdaush, Advocate
For the Indian Bank : Mr. Shiv Mohan Sah, Advocate

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY

ORAL ORDER

7 06-11-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Phulwarisharif P.S. Case No. 1904 of 2025 for the offence under sections 318(4), 316(2) and 303(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 lodged on 26.11.2025 by the informant, Gita Devi.

3. The informant, Gita Devi is the mother of the petitioner no. 2, Arun Kumar and mother-in-law of the petitioner no. 1, Priyanka Kumari.

4. The allegation is that her husband, Shambhu

WEB COPY

Narayan Singh breathe his last on 17.10.2025 and immediately thereafter, his son, Arun Kumar started misusing the bank account of her late husband. On 10.11.2025, the balance amount in her account was Rs. 40,92,870.84/-, which was regularly brought down by the accused. Further, on **18.11.2025**, she gave an application to the **Cyber Police Station** which was acknowledged vide number **30811250095438**. On the same day, the Indian Bank freezed the bank account but despite that on 26.11.2025, when she visited the bank, came to know that Rs. 8,06,884/-, the remaining amount has also been withdrawn with the help of the Bank Manager.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the mother after the death of the father of the petitioner no.02 ran away with the documents/property papers and is presently staying with his sister. She has falsely lodged the FIR for which he will be taking appropriate steps for getting the FIR quashed.

6. Learned APP, Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh opposes the prayer submitting that such huge amount was siphoned of by the petitioners which actually belonged to the lady/mother-informant.

7. Learned counsel for the informant submits that even the joint account was in the name of the lady and the

WEB COPY

petitioner being the son misused the mobile to get money siphoned of in favour himself as also his wife.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that though it was in the joint account of the mother and late father, actually it was business amount and he was one of the stake holder.

9. Taking into account the submissions of the parties aforesaid as also the role the petitioners have played in siphoning of the huge amount after the death of his father, no relief can be extended.

10. The anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Ravi/-

U		T	

WEB COPY